FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

# Daily Report

# Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-195
Tuesday
9 October 1990

# Daily Report
## Soviet Union

*FBIS-SOV-90-195* *9 October 1990*

CONTENTS

**NOTICE TO READERS:** An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.


**ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT**

CFE Talks Plenary Session Held in Vienna 4 Oct *[TASS]* ..... 1
Baker-Shevardnadze CFE Talks Reported, Assessed ..... 1
Six-Hour Round of Talks Held *[IZVESTIYA 5 Oct]* ..... 1
Bush 'Happy' With Progress *[PRAVDA 6 Oct]* ..... 2
'Decisive Breakthrough' Hailed *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 2
'Considerable Problems' Remain *[IZVESTIYA 7 Oct]* ..... 2

**WORLDWIDE ISSUES**

Shevardnadze Concludes UN Visit in New York ..... 4
Visit Labeled 'Unprecedented' *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 4
Foreign Ministers Consulted *[IZVESTIYA 6 Oct]* ..... 4
Shevardnadze Receives Prize *[TASS]* ..... 4
UN Address Alarms Deputies *[TASS]* ..... 5
Cambodian Situation Discussed *[TASS]* ..... 5
Peace Monument Presented to UN *[TASS]* ..... 5
Petrovskiy Assails Iraq in UN Assembly Address *[TASS]* ..... 6
Armed Soviet Officials Board Greenpeace Ship *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION]* ..... 6
KGB Border Patrol Detains Ship *[TASS]* ..... 7
Greenpeace Crew Interviewed 30 Sep *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Sep]* ..... 7
Worldwide Labor Group's Director Visits Moscow ..... 7
Received by Lukyanov 4 Oct *[TASS]* ..... 7
Confers With Gorbachev 5 Oct *[PRAVDA 6 Oct]* ..... 7
Signs Joint Cooperation Accord *[TASS]* ..... 8
Gorbachev Receives Credentials From Ambassadors *[TASS]* ..... 8
TASS Reports on Gremitskikh's 5 Oct Briefing ..... 8
Shevardnadze Meeting on Gulf ..... 8
German Unification Speeches ..... 9
Hungary's Goncz Visits Ukraine ..... 9
Reduced Oil Supplies to CSFR ..... 9
'Breakthrough' on CSCE Security Issues Hailed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Oct]* ..... 9

**INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

**United States & Canada**

Shevardnadze, Baker Continue Talks in New York ..... 12
Meet 5 Oct *[TASS]* ..... 12
Discuss Arms Reductions *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 12
Shevardnadze Departs 5 Oct *[TASS]* ..... 12
Defense Minister Moiseyev Continues U.S. Visit ..... 12
'Cordial' Reception Noted *[IZVESTIYA 5 Oct]* ..... 12
Sees Air, Naval Bases *[TASS]* ..... 13
Holds News Conference *[TASS]* ..... 13
Concludes Visit *[Moscow TV]* ..... 14
Joint U.S. News Conference Held at UN *[TASS]* ..... 14
Joint U.S. Stock Market Seminar Opens *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 14
Canadian Communist Party Congress Greeted *[TASS]* ..... 14

## China

PRC Foreign Economic Minister Visits ..... 15
Received by Ryzhkov *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 15
Trade Agreement Discussed *[PRAVDA 6 Oct]* ..... 15
Agreement Signed *[IZVESTIYA 4 Oct]* ..... 15
Meets With Leningrad Official *[Moscow International]* ..... 15
Scientific Conference on Ties With China Held *[IZVESTIYA 5 Oct]* ..... 15

## Northeast Asia

Reports Continue on Kurils Debate With Japan ..... 16
Return of Islands Said Planned *[IZVESTIYA 8 Oct]* ..... 16
Plan Could Facilitate Peace Treaty *[Moscow TV]* ..... 16
Ministry Denies Changed Stance *[TASS]* ..... 16
Shevardnadze Issues Denial *[Tokyo KYODO]* ..... 16
Reports Called 'Disinformation' *[TASS]* ..... 18
DPRK Reaction to ROK-USSR Ties Eyed ..... 18
'High Emotion Persists' *[Moscow International]* ..... 18
Seen as Effort To Split Koreas *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 19
DPRK Daily Calls Ties 'Betrayal' *[Moscow International]* ..... 19
DPRK Rebuff Called 'Regrettable' *[TASS]* ..... 19
DPRK Fears Dismissed *[Matveyev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Oct]* ..... 20
Korean Views Failure of UN Entry Bid *[Moscow International]* ..... 20

## Near East & South Asia

Israelis Kill Palestinians in Jerusalem ..... 21
Foreign Ministry Issues Statement *[TASS]* ..... 21
Israeli Actions Decried *[TASS]* ..... 21
Gulf Council Ministers Meet With Shevardnadze *[Riyadh TV]* ..... 21
Mideast Envoy Primakov Continues Visit to Iraq ..... 22
Meets With Saddam *[TASS]* ..... 22
'Optimistic' After Talks *[Moscow International]* ..... 22
Agreement on Specialists Reached *[Moscow TV]* ..... 22
Belousov Interviewed on Results *[Moscow TV]* ..... 23
Palestinian Envoy Interviewed on Gulf Crisis *[NEW TIMES No 38]* ..... 23
Reports, Comments Continue on Specialists in Iraq ..... 24
Over 100 Return to Moscow *[Moscow TV]* ..... 24
'Fate' of Remaining Experts Eyed *[IZVEZTIYA 9 Oct]* ..... 25
Commentaries Report on, Assess Gulf Crisis ..... 25
Soviet Involvement Unlikely *[Bovin on Moscow TV]* ..... 25
UN Role Viewed *[TASS]* ..... 26
'Tragic Climax' Expected *[Moscow International]* ..... 27
Iranian Conservatives' Support of Iraq Eyed *[Radio Peace and Progress]* ..... 27
Omani Deputy Premier Continues Visit *[TASS]* ..... 28
Lukyanov's Talks With Omani Delegation Continue *[IZVESTIYA 6 Oct]* ..... 28
Greetings Exchanged With Oman on Anniversary *[IZVESTIYA 4 Oct]* ..... 28

## East Europe

Trade Official Discusses Oil Deliveries to CSFR *[TASS]* ..... 29
CSFR's Calfa Discusses Oil Supply *[Moscow TV]* ..... 29
PRAVDA Warns of East Europe 'Authoritarianism' *[6 Oct]* ..... 30

## West Europe

Soviet Soldiers Desert, Sell Weapons in Germany *[Moscow TV]* ..... 31
Spokesman on Gorbachev Visits to Germany, France *[Berlin ADN]* ..... 31
Lukyanov Receives Icelandic Parliament Delegation *[Moscow TV]* ..... 31
Talks With Icelanders Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 6 Oct]* ..... 31

## NATIONAL AFFAIRS

### Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Chambers Meet 8 Oct *[Moscow TV]* ..... 32
Chambers Meet Separately To Discuss Banking Bills *[TASS]* ..... 32
Bill Seen as 'Core' of Reform *[TASS]* ..... 33
Supreme Soviet To Control Bank *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 33
Gerashchenko Presents Bank Bill *[Moscow TV]* ..... 34
'Tentative' Agenda for Week's Session Circulated *[IZVESTIYA 9 Oct]* ..... 34
Deputies Want Nuclear Test Treaties Ratified *[IZVESTIYA 6 Oct]* ..... 35
PRAVDA Reports on Treaty Recommendations *[5 Oct]* ..... 35
Supreme Soviet Committees, Commissions Meet 5 Oct ..... 35
Committee Views Nuclear Pollution *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 35
Commission Discusses Folk Art *[Moscow TV]* ..... 36
Presidium Rules on Vandalism *[Moscow TV]* ..... 36

### Political & Social

CPSU Central Committee Plenum Meets 8 Oct ..... 37
Topics Include Economy, Other Matters *[PRAVDA 9 Oct]* ..... 37
Gorbachev Speaks to Plenum *[TASS]* ..... 37
Ivashko Reports to Plenum *[PRAVDA 9 Oct]* ..... 41
Further on Hijacking to Finland ..... 49
Hijacker Profiled *[TASS]* ..... 49
Hijacker Held in Finland *[Moscow TV]* ..... 50
Moscow Rally Supports Alternative Service *[TASS]* ..... 50
Council of Ministers Presidium Discusses Crime *[TASS]* ..... 50
Ryzhkov Interviewed on Plans To Combat Crime *[Moscow TV]* ..... 50
Moscow CPSU Committee Holds Plenum 5 Oct *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 53
Action Program-90 Called 'Soap Bubble' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Oct]* ..... 54
Economic Implications of 'Breakup' of USSR *[IZVESTIYA 6 Oct]* ..... 54
Gorbachev Meets With Cultural Leaders 29 Sep *[PRAVDA 3 Oct]* ..... 56

### Economic

Gorbachev Decree on Devaluation Expected 'Soon' *[Moscow TV]* ..... 81
News Conference Held on Gorbachev Economic Decree ..... 81
Petrkov, Abalkin Explain Decree *[TASS]* ..... 81
Abalkin's Remarks Detailed *[Moscow TV]* ..... 82
Gorbachev, Advisers Discuss Market Reform Draft *[Moscow TV]* ..... 82
Oil Association Threatens Work Stoppage 20 Oct *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 82

### Scientific

Update on Cosmonauts' Continuing Experiments *[TASS]* ..... 82
Expedition To Monitor Black Sea Pollution *[Moscow TV]* ..... 83

## REGIONAL AFFAIRS

### Baltic Republics

Baltic Leaders Discuss Common Economic Policy *[TASS]* ..... 84
Prunskiene Comments *[Vilnius International]* ..... 84
Lithuanian Supreme Council Meets 5 Oct *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 84
Leaders Criticize Planned Polish Meeting *[TASS]* ..... 85
Landsbergis Makes TV Appeal *[Vilnius International]* ..... 85
Polish Autonomy Move Viewed *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 85
Vilnius Meeting Discusses Polish Autonomy Issue *[TASS]* ..... 86
Polish National Area Declared *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 87

Leaders Interviewed on Talks With Moscow ..... 87
Landsbergis Views Talks *[Vilnius International]* ..... 87
Ozolas Expects Treaty With USSR *[TASS]* ..... 87
Lithuanian Official Urges Youth To Ignore Draft *[TASS]* ..... 88
Vilnius Council Disapproves of Soviet Army March *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 88
French Bank Reportedly Holds Baltic Gold *[Vilnius International]* ..... 88
Landsbergis European Visits Outlined *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 88
Latvian People's Front Holds Third Congress ..... 89
Program Rejects Communism *[IZVESTIYA 2 Oct]* ..... 89
Congress Opens *[TASS]* ..... 89
Razuks Elected New Leader *[TASS]* ..... 89
Razuks on Main Task *[Moscow TV]* ..... 90
Goldmanis Addresses Congress *[Riga Radio]* ..... 90
Congress Meets for Second Day *[TASS]* ..... 91
Latvian People's Front Congress Concludes *[TASS]* ..... 91
Estonia To Nationalize Communist Party Property *[TASS]* ..... 92

**RSFSR**

Coverage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings ..... 92
5 Oct Session Reported *[Moscow TV]* ..... 92
Bill on Ownership Discussed *[TASS]* ..... 93
8 Oct Session Reported *[Moscow TV]* ..... 94
9 Oct Session Reported *[Moscow TV]* ..... 94
RSFSR Politburo Discusses Perestroyka, Economy *[TASS]* ..... 94
Paper Reports Meeting *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Oct]* ..... 95
Yeltsin's State of Health Reported 'Normal' *[Moscow TV]* ..... 96
Leningrad Communists Appeal to CPSU Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 96
Leningrad Fuel Reserves To Run Out 22 Oct *[Moscow International]* ..... 96
Buryat Autonomous Republic Declares Sovereignty *[TASS]* ..... 96
Koryak District Declares Itself Republic *[Moscow TV]* ..... 97
7 Oct Aircraft Hijack Attempt Foiled *[TASS]* ..... 97

**Western Republics**

Belorussia, Kazakhstan Sign Cooperation Pacts *[Moscow TV]* ..... 97
Further Coverage of Unrest Among Crimean Tatars ..... 97
Tatars To Defend Tent Cities *[IZVESTIYA 5 Oct]* ..... 97
Situation 'Remains Tense' *[PRAVDA 7 Oct]* ..... 98
Militia Sent to Crimea *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 98
Crimean Tatar Paper Changes Name, Format *[LENIN BAYRAGI 22 Sep]* ..... 98
Disorder Interrupts Ukrainian Parliament Session *[IZVESTIYA 3 Oct]* ..... 98
Pro-Constitution Rally Held in Kiev *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 99
Ukrainian, RSFSR Deputies Discuss Ties *[TASS]* ..... 99

**Caucasus**

Gorbachev Receives Armenia's Movsisyan 6 Oct *[Yerevan Radio]* ..... 99
Armenian Supreme Soviet Makes Appointments *[ARMENPRES]* ..... 100
First Armenian Defense Regiment Takes Oath *[Yerevan Radio]* ..... 100
Armenia Faces Winter Without Gas Supplies *[IZVESTIYA 5 Oct]* ..... 100
Citizenship Restored to Armenian Exile Ayrikyan *[ARMENPRES]* ..... 100
Coverage of Events in NKAO Region Reported ..... 101
'Unauthorized Secret Elections' Planned *[Baku Radio]* ..... 101
Azerbaijan Protests EC Visit *[TASS]* ..... 101
Notes Exchanged on 'Aggression' *[TASS]* ..... 101
Irregularities in Baku Election Reported *[Moscow TV]* ..... 101
No Results Reported *[Moscow TV]* ..... 102
Strike at Dzhul'fa Train Depot Reported *[Baku Radio]* ..... 102
Azerbaijan Trade Union Council Holds Congress *[Baku Radio]* ..... 102

## Central Asia

Central Asian Republics To Expand Cooperation *[IZVESTIYA 2 Oct]* ..... 103
Ust-Kamenogorsk Suspends Sovereignty Debate *[IZVESTIYA 29 Sep]* ..... 103
Plague Quarantine Lifted in Kazakh's Aralsk *[TASS]* ..... 104
Kazakhstan Declares 6 Oct as 'Republic Day' *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 104
Tajikistan Decides Islamic Party Unconstitutional *[Dushanbe Radio]* ..... 104
Party Meets Despite Ban *[TASS]* ..... 104
Tajik Central Committee Plenum Held 4 Oct *[Dushanbe Radio]* ..... 105
Tajik Democratic Party Launches Newspaper *[TASS]* ..... 105
Niyazov Proposed for Turkmenistan President *[Ashkhabad Radio]* ..... 105
Uzbekistan Draft Citizenship Law Decried *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 39]* ..... 105
Uzbek Council of Ministers Presidium Meets 6 Oct *[Tashkent Radio]* ..... 106

## CFE Talks Plenary Session Held in Vienna 4 Oct

*LD0410172490 Moscow TASS in English 1643 GMT 4 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna October 4 TASS—A regular plenary session was held today at the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe, which turned from a forum of 23 countries into a forum of 22 after the reunification of Germany.

It was "Germany's Day," and head of the German delegation Ambassador Ruediger Hartmann, who was receiving congratulations on German reunification, became its hero. He made a statement, stressing that his country's foreign policy would be orientated towards partnership and close international cooperation and that nothing but peace would come from Germany.

Hartmann pointed out that the New York meeting of foreign ministers had made "decisive progress on the problems remaining open," which are being discussed at the Vienna talks. This refers, in the first place, to the quotas and the setting of upper limits for tanks, artillery, helicopters and armoured vehicles, as well as the air force problem.

Speaking at a press conference here, Hartmann said that more than 50 percent of the text of the future treaty on conventional armed forces had already been coordinated. He expressed confidence that the document would be ready by the beginning of the all-European summit in Paris in November.

Representatives of Hungary and Belgium told the plenary session about the holding of reciprocal inspections of military facilities on territories of the two countries.

## Baker-Shevardnadze CFE Talks Reported, Assessed

### Six-Hour Round of Talks Held

*PM0510114390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 1*

[Report by correspondent A. Shalnev: "Obstacle Overcome; Important Accord on Reducing Armed Forces and Arms in Europe"]

[Text] New York—On the conference table, among the mountains of notebooks and stacks of ordinary pencils sharpened to fine points, there lied a calculator. An ordinary pocket calculator. It turned out it was the main instrument in the work of one of the U.S. participants, who scrupulously calculated each option as it arose for resolving the problems which have proved to be the main ones at these talks—talks that continued for nearly six hours.

Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Secretary of State James Baker and their small teams of experts spent half a day at this table in the Soviet UN mission's parade room. They were engaged for half a day in virtually just one point on the agenda of their meeting—the agreement on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe.

At the end of the six-hour marathon journalists were told the result. "We have reached mutual understanding on all basic problems," Eduard Shevardnadze said.

The most important thing is that mutual understanding has been reached on the problem which gave rise to the greatest contradictions and which, it seemed only a few days ago, would ultimately simply be put outside the talks' frame of reference and put off "for later," for subsequent years. I have in mind the problem of aircraft.

E. Shevardnadze and J. Baker, relying on the aid of experts, including the expert armed with the calculator, were able to agree on specific figures for levels. As I understand it, the overall level for the Soviet Union was set at a little over 5,000 aircraft.

There is also an accord on the number of ground-based naval aircraft. But sources have asked that the exact figure not be cited yet.

It is true that one snag remains: the helicopter problem.

There are several other snags, which are also resolvable. And, overall, to judge by the statements of E. Shevardnadze and his U.S. counterpart, the agreement may be considered to have been worked out in principle. Ahead lie the United States' consultations with its NATO allies and the USSR's consultations with its Warsaw Pact allies. The aim of the consultations is to agree on the document which should be ready for signing by the heads of state and government at the Paris meeting in November this year.

According to J. Baker he does not predict any complications on the part of the NATO partners. Will there be complications from the "Warsaw" partners?

At the six-hour meeting in the Soviet mission there was not enough time for the other points on the agenda. They managed to touch very briefly on several problems of strategic offensive arms limitation. The main discussion will be on Friday, when Baker and Shevardnadze will hold one more meeting, the fifth this week. The meeting is necessary, the Soviet minister said, "to prepare the ground to complete work on the strategic offensive weapons treaty."

The meeting also produced a joint Soviet-U.S. statement on the United Nations. It may be understood that the statement, called "responsibility for peace and security in a changing world," was compiled earlier and was not the subject of special debates between the minister and the secretary of state. One of the most interesting elements of this document was the resolve voiced by both countries "to provide the United Nations with sufficient resources for its effective work through the prompt fulfillment of financial commitments to it." This phrase which, to all appearances, was provided with some

difficulty by the U.S. Administration, which is experiencing very grave budget difficulties, means that Washington will now have to seek funds to extinguish its enormous debt of over $0.5 billion to the United Nations.

Our debts are approximately one quarter of that.

### Bush 'Happy' With Progress

*PM0810142190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Second Edition pp 1, 4*

[TASS report: "Good Prospects"]

[Text] Washington, 5 Oct.—U.S. President George Bush has stated that he is "very happy with the progress" achieved during the third working session in New York between U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze in resolving the problems of cutting conventional armed forces in Europe [CFE].

"I want to recall," he said at a White House press conference, "that a CFE treaty will not be an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is a treaty which will be concluded by 22 countries in both the East and West. They must all be satisfied with the treaty's provisions."

G. Bush stated that the United States intends, together with its allies, to "conclude the treaty within the next month" to open the way for the Paris summit of the heads of state and government of the CSCE countries. The Paris summit is scheduled for 19-21 November.

### 'Decisive Breakthrough' Hailed

*LD0610111490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Commentary by political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] As we have already reported, during the New York meeting between USSR Foreign Minister Shevardadze and U.S. Secretary of State Baker mutual understanding was reached on issues relating to cutting armaments in Europe. Political observer Aleksandr Zholkver comments on these agreements:

[Zholkver] I shall point out first of all that the problems discussed in New York are pretty complex. After all, for decades it was thought that the security of states was ensured primarily by the number of tanks, aircraft, and ships they had. Then missiles and nuclear munitions were added. The question of the number of these, of all these levels and sub-levels, was discussed for many years at the Vienna negotiations. I frequently had occasion to be at the Hofburg Palace, where these negotiations were in progress, and see their ineffectiveness with my own eyes.

It was only just recently that it has finally been possible to shift the Vienna negotiations from a standstill and now to reach, in New York, a decisive breakthrough in the matter of real disarmament. This was reached, in my opinion, because a fundamentally new approach to the problem of security predominated. It now seems to be clear to everyone that one's own security cannot be ensured by excessive armaments which infringe upon the security of others. To say nothing of the fact that armaments cost huge sums of money. In our nuclear age, security in general can only be mutual, common. In New York, both at the meeting of foreign ministers of the 35 states and at the Soviet-U.S. talks, nonstandard interbloc agreements were worked out on all-European documents. For these, it is less important how many tanks and aircraft one side or the other will have. Incidentally, right up to the last few days the most contentious question was precisely that of aviation. Far more important is the creation of common European security structures, from regular meetings of heads of government of all the European states and their ministers of foreign affairs, to the formation of an all-European secretariat and a special center for prevention and settlement of conflicts in Europe.

We shall not, of course, get carried away by euphoria. In building a European home we are starting, as builders say, at square one, and as a rule that is the most difficult one. Yet during these very same days there has been the settlement of a question as difficult as the German question, which for decades exacerbated the situation in Europe. If the USSR and U.S. foreign ministers now also sign in New York a joint statement on responsibility for peace and security in a changing world, then I think one can state that the world really is changing for the better.

### 'Considerable Problems' Remain

*PM0810150390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[Report by correspondent A. Shalnev: "Some Problems Solved, Some Remain: Hours of Marathon Talks Between USSR and U.S. Foreign Ministers Conclude"]

[Text] New York—Another round of multi-hour marathon talks was held in New York Friday between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. In the few hours that remained before the minister's departure for Moscow, they tried to resolve a series of problems which had resisted solution in previous rounds and which had made it impossible to enter the finishing straight—namely, the treaties on strategic offensive arms and conventional arms in Europe.

Were the attempts a success?

In the secretary of state's words, "Our day was successful and productive." The foreign minister added: "We are a little tired but the results are good."

The results are good primarily because one can now talk with almost total confidence about the prospect of

signing a treaty on conventional armed forces and armaments at the Paris meeting of heads of state and government belonging to the Helsinki process. All the fundamental difficulties have been eliminated, including those which proved intractable at the previous meeting on Wednesday.

Without even waiting for this meeting to end, Oleg Grinevskiy, head of our delegation at the Vienna talks who was accompanying E. Shevardnadze on his trip to New York, flew back to Vienna to add the finishing touches to the treaty's wording.

On strategic arms, as the secretary of state noted, "We were able to make good progress." But, by all accounts, the progress was not so significant that it could be said after the meeting: We have a treaty!

Very considerable problems remain. As I understand it, the main one is the so-called "problem of the noncircumvention" of the future treaty. Our side is not opposed to the U.S. completion of its previously promised deliveries of Trident-2 missiles to Britain but we are opposed to the continuation of this kind of cooperation in the future and to Trident-2 being followed by, for example, Trident-3 or air-launched cruise missiles.

The Americans are refusing to publicly make commitments which, as they suggest, would harm their "special relationship" with Britain.

Is there a way out of this impasse? There is, our delegation has suggested to me; it is possible to find an acceptable way to formulate the solution of the problem with a little thought. But on Friday, unfortunately, that formula was not found.

Without the formula, the solutions to other problems, particularly the problem of testing our SS-18 heavy missiles, remain in the air. According to my information, the Americans are ready to drop their demands for a limitation on the testing of these missiles on the condition that we make a concession to them on the question of "noncircumvention." But unless the missile-testing problem is resolved, the sides will not make progress on the question of the number of Soviet Backfire bombers. That, as I understand it, is our linkage.

On the other hand, the question of the nondestruction of missiles—to use the expression of the participants in the talks—has been resolved. Not all the missiles to be taken out of service will be destroyed. Some other peaceful use will be found for them, one which is more rational and economical. Facilities have to be launched into space so why not use the disarmed missiles for that purpose?

It is a striking fact that many years ago when talks were being held on strategic arms limitation (SALT-2), we suggested to the Americans: Let us not destroy our missiles. The Americans were categorically opposed to that. Then at the strategic offensive weapons talks, they themselves suggested: Let us not destroy them; let us limit the destruction to the delivery vehicles. This time we were opposed. Then we agreed, probably remembering the criticism in our country at the quite ill-considered [neprodumannyy] treatment of the missiles which were due for destruction under the agreement on medium- and short-range missiles.

Difficulties—and they are considerable—remain in connection with the strategic offensive weapons treaty. But, as E. Shevardnadze has said, "the final stage of the talks requires meticulous work. That is why there should be no surprise if we do not resolve all the questions."

There is a hope that this will be achieved in Washington, which the head of our Foreign Ministry will visit in November, as the Secretary of State and the Foreign Minister agreed. Then, clearly, there will be a specific discussion on the timing of a trip to the USSR by President Bush in which it is planned that one of the highlights will be the signing of a treaty on strategic offensive weapons.

## Shevardnadze Concludes UN Visit in New York

### Visit Labeled 'Unprecedented'

*LD0510182690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Report by Andrey Ptashnikov]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The visit to New York by Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze ends today. Our special correspondent Andrey Ptashnikov reports:

[Ptashnikov] This visit by the Soviet minister to New York was unprecedented both in its duration—almost two weeks—and the way it was packed with events. [passage omitted]

At this moment, by the way, as this bulletin is going out, the fifth and final conversation between Comrade Shevardnadze and James Baker is under way in New York. As far as we journalists are aware, matters to do with reducing strategic offensive weapons are being discussed. So one can say without any exaggeration that for the past two weeks New York has been the center of world politics. They were also two weeks in the course of which, in their desire to deal with the crisis in the Persian Gulf, the member-states of the United Nations emerged perhaps more united than they have ever before. Of course, unresolved problems still remain—there are indeed still more than enough of them. But the fact that the participants in the discussions, meetings, and talks held in New York now have a better mutual understanding and have taken a substantial step in getting cooperation going is an incontrovertible one.

### Foreign Ministers Consulted

*PM0910100990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Conversations in New York"]

[Text] New York, 5 Oct—On Thursday, Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze had another series of conversations with his colleagues who are in New York at this time.

E.A. Shevardnadze had a meeting with Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen. They had a thorough exchange of opinions on international events since the Soviet-Chinese talks in Harbin and touched on some aspects of bilateral relations. During their discussion of the situation on the Korean peninsula both ministers advocated developing relations between the DPRK, Japan, and the United States, which would help ease tension in northwest Asia.

E.A. Shevardnadze had a conversation with Mongolian Foreign Minister T. Gombosuren. They discussed developing Soviet-Mongolian relations and improving cooperation in various spheres. T. Gombosuren spoke of Mongolia's support for the Soviet idea of holding a meeting involving the Asia-Pacific region states' foreign ministers in Vladivostok in 1993.

During their conversation E.A. Shevardnadze and Romanian Foreign Minister A. Nastase voiced the mutual desire to seek to enrich Soviet-Romanian relations under the difficult conditions produced by the profound transformations being carried out in both countries. The ministers were united in saying that preserving a transformed Warsaw Pact and CEMA would accord with the interests of the member countries. They stressed the need to respect Europe's existing borders and observe the Helsinki Final Act.

The Iraqi aggression and other Near East problems were the subject of discussion during E.A. Shevardnadze's meeting with the Gulf Cooperation Council foreign ministers, in which the leaders of the following foreign policy departments took part: Yusuf Bin-al-Alawi 'Abdallah of Oman; S. al-Sabah of Kuwait; M.'A. al-Khatir of Qatar; S. al-Faysal Al Sa'ud of Saudi Arabia; R. al-Nu'aymi of the UAE; and Karim Ibrahim al-Shakir, Bahraini UN representative.

E.A. Shevardnadze had a separate conversation with Kuwaiti Foreign Minister S. al-Sabah.

During their conversation E.A. Shevardnadze and A. Filali, Moroccan minister of state for foreign affairs and cooperation, examined the prospects for a political settlement in the Persian Gulf.

The exchange of opinions between E.A. Shevardnadze and Pakistani Foreign Minister S. Yaqub Khan revealed coincidence in their fundamental assessments of contemporary international trends. S. Yaqub Khan spoke highly of the USSR's foreign policy course, in particular expressing firm support for the Soviet initiative for a meeting of Asia-Pacific region foreign ministers in Vladivostok in 1993.

E.A. Shevardnadze stressed that the Soviet leadership intends to continue making unremitting efforts to achieve the release of Soviet soldiers imprisoned in Afghanistan. S. Yaqub Khan assured him that the Pakistani Government will do everything it can to facilitate this.

The ministers agreed to hold Soviet-Pakistani consultations at a working level on a broad range of problems, including the Afghan problem.

E.A. Shevardnadze and Bangladesh Foreign Minister A.I. Mahmud discussed questions of bilateral relations and the most acute international problems.

### Shevardnadze Receives Prize

*LD0510192190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1740 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Menkes and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Excerpts] United Nations, 5 Oct (TASS)—Today in New York a ceremony was held to give Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze the George Kennan Prize. [passage omitted] Accepting the prize, E.A. Shevardnadze said: I am glad that we are indeed moving toward the relations of partners. With all their drama, the events in the Persian Gulf region today have brightly illuminated their significance for the fate of the world. The weight, authority, and potential of the USSR and the United States are such that their mutual understanding and cooperation cannot be determined by individual interest. We are living in an era in which everything is interconnected and everyone is dependent on each other, when there is really no such thing as someone else's misfortune and woe, when it is impossible to create an oasis of prosperity in the planetary desert of disasters, as it is impossible to defend only oneself from nuclear or other catastrophes.

In the face of these threats, the extremely great responsibility of the USSR and the United States of America is to jointly remove them from the renewed world. This is not only a question of strategy or technology. It is the problem of supporting everything progressive, humane, and common to mankind, and we must try to solve it, without pretending to omniscience and the universality of our own prescriptions, and to be absolutely open to the wisdom and experience of others. If the guilt of our two countries in postwar enmity is great, then just as great must be our input into the construction of new relations between states and peoples.

The 20th century is drawing to a close, the USSR foreign minister stressed. Who can say what the third millenium will be like? And if it will come? I am an optimist. I am convinced that mankind is irreversibly entering the stream of unity, the channel of acknowledging our common fate, notwithstanding great national and international diversity.

I thank the founders of the George Kennan Prize and the man himself, not for the prize, but for what it expressed. For me, personally, this is an advance as well, a strong incentive to continue what has been begun. It will help me and, I think, Mr. Baker to fulfill the instructions of the USSR and U.S. presidents given to us in Helsinki: to prepare by the end of the year agreements in the security sphere without which advancement is blocked, E.A. Shevardnadze stressed in conclusion.

### UN Address Alarms Deputies

*LD0510193890 Moscow TASS in English 1932 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow October 5 TASS—A group of Soviet parliamentarians has voiced "alarm and bewilderment" in connection with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's statement at the United Nations on the possibility of sending a Soviet military contingent to the Gulf.

The group, calling itself Soyuz (Union), unites more than 400 Soviet people's deputies. It favours the preservation of a strong Soviet Union and opposes secessionist tendencies.

The group said in a statement released in Moscow today that although "the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait cannot but cause indignation and condemnation by all honest people," the issue should be solved "by political means and not by the use of military force."

The group's coordinator Viktor Alksnis told TASS that the group's reaction had been prompted by the fact that Soviet people's deputies had not been prompted by the fact that Soviet people's deputies had not been informed about the decision behind Shevardnadze's statement.

He pointed out that the decision had not been submitted for the preliminary consideration and approval of the USSR Supreme Soviet and said the group has demanded an immediate parliamentary investigation of the issue.

### Cambodian Situation Discussed

*LD0610013290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0043 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] United Nations, 6 Oct (TASS)—A conversation took place here between Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and Vietnamese foreign minister Nguyen Co Thach. The main topic was a definitive Cambodian settlement which, in the opinion of both ministers, is now a fully achievable aim. The necessity for thorough preparation for the Paris conference on Cambodia was stressed.

E.A. Shevardnadze received B. Ghali, the Egyptian minister of state for foreign affairs. The situation in the Persian Gulf and in the Near East as a whole, as well as Soviet-Egyptian relations, were discussed.

A conversation has taken place between Eduard Shevardnadze and Tesfaye Dinka, the Ethiopian foreign minister. The situation on the Horn of Africa, as well as a number of aspects in Soviet-Ethiopian relations, were discussed at this conversation.

### Peace Monument Presented to UN

*LD0610131190 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Menkes and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] United Nations, October 6 (TASS)—A ceremony of unveiling a monument created by Soviet sculptor Zurab Tsereteli took place at the U.N. Headquarters.

Numerous diplomats, U.N. staff members and reporters gathered on the lawn in front of the U.N. Headquarters on Friday evening. They saw a new sculptural composition called "Good Defeats Evil."

Bronze St. George on a rampant horse kills two dragons with his lance. The artist has updated the image of the saint: Visitors noticed parts of missiles beween the dragons' scales. They are the American Pershing-2 and the Soviet SS-20.

The missiles are real. They were prepared for destruction and handed over to the sculptor by Soviet and American military specialists.

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze presented the monument to the United Nations as a gift on behalf of the Soviet Government and at the request of the author who was present at the ceremony.

Shevardnadze read out a letter from President Mikhail Gorbachev to the U.N. secretary-general.

The unveiling of "the Monument of Peace" at the U.N. Headquarters, which was made out of the remains of destroyed intermediate missiles, is a homage to the beginning of history's first real disarmament, the letter reads.

It is a symbol of new Soviet-American relations and a herald of a new period in the history of mankind. The United Nations is now irreplaceable, since it is assuming the role envisaged for it at its inception.

Let "the Monument of Peace" personify the unity of nations, mass movements and parties, scholars and men of culture in their efforts for the sake of peace and accord now and in future, the letter says.

U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar received "the Monument of Peace" on behalf of the United Nations.

He stressed the importance of positive changes in the world, including the relaxation of tension in Soviet-American relations. Cuellar praised the sculpture by Soviet artist.

Addressing the gathering, U.S. State Secretary James Baker read out a congratulatory message from President George Bush who pointed to the propitious time for unveiling the sculpture now that Soviet-American relations passed beyond containment and confrontation.

### Petrovskiy Assails Iraq in UN Assembly Address

*LD0610023690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0122 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[By TASS corrspondent Mikhail Kochetov]

[Excerpts] UN, 6 Oct (TASS)—The UN General Assembly, which was addressed by the Iraqi representative, Sabah Kadrat, during a general political discussion on Friday, has expressed condemnation of the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait. [passage omitted]

Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, having taken the floor, called upon Iraq to begin implementing the Security Council's resolutions. He expressed confidence that the United Nations would be able to cope with this very dangerous crisis. Under conditions where a new international order based on the primacy of international law is being formed, it is the duty of every country to heed the UN's opinion and to draw practical conclusions from this for its own policies, he stressed.

The Soviet delegation considered it necessary to take the floor to confirm that it categorically rejects the Iraqi appraisal of the Security Council's resolutions in relation to the Iraqi-Kuwaiti crisis as allegedly not reflecting the opinion of not only the council, but also of the international community as a whole. This was stated by Vladimir Petrovskiy in an interview with the TASS correspondent after the session. Not only the Security Council, but also the entire General Assembly unambiguously codemns Iraq's aggression against Kuwait. Therefore, we considered it necessary to clearly support the Security Council's resolutions and call upon Iraq to finally hear the voice of the international community and carry out the resolutions of a body such as the Security Council which, by virtue of the UN Charter, is invested with the right to adopt resolutions which are binding on all countries, Petrovskiy pointed out.

### Armed Soviet Officials Board Greenpeace Ship

*LD0810114290 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1057 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[By Gavin Cordon, Press Association]

[Text] A Greenpeace ship was boarded by armed Soviet officials today after landing protesters near a Soviet nuclear weapons testing site, the environmental group claimed. Communications with the MV Greenpeace were cut after the 15-strong boarding party, armed with semi-automatic rifles, took control of the vessel. Moments earlier Greenpeace members in London, who were speaking with the ship by satellite telephone, heard the Soviet officials apparently breaking down the locked door of the radio room.

"We are outraged that the Soviet authorities have boarded our ship," said Greenpeace spokeswoman Rebecca Johnson. London members have since failed to re-establish contact with the ship, which was drifting in the Barents Sea off the Arctic island of Novaya Zemlya. The ship, which had six Soviet citizens on board including a people's deputy of the USSR, was protesting at the resumption by the Soviets of nuclear weapons testing on the island. Last night the crew managed to land a four-strong party on Novaya Zemlya. They were trying to hike to the testing site.

Greenpeace said the party reached the shore despite the attentions of a Soviet icebreaker which had been trailing the vessel.

Flares were fired at the party's inflatable speedboat and at one point the Soviet crew, thought by Greenpeace to be under the command of the KGB, threatened to open fire. It was shortly after this incident that the MV

Greenpeace was boarded, initially by a group of five armed men from the icebreaker and then by the full boarding party.

Greenpeace activists were urgently trying to establish through the campaign's Moscow office what had happened to the vessel and the landing party.

### KGB Border Patrol Detains Ship

*LD0810123290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1203 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Borisov]

[Text] Moscow, 8 Oct (TASS)—The vessel Greenpeace, sailing under a Dutch flag, was stopped near the Novaya Zemlya islands today by a Soviet border patrol ship. Your correspondent was told in the Public Relations Center of the USSR KGB that the vessel has been detained "for deliberate violation of the state border of the USSR, refusal to obey the border authorities, putting people ashore in unidentified locations, and attempting to enter an area closed to shipping." According to the USSR KGB, "in order to detain the vessel the border guards were obliged to fire warning shots. In the near future it will be escorted to the Kola Bay for a subsequent inquiry."

### Greenpeace Crew Interviewed 30 Sep

*PM0510134590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Sep 90 First Edition p 4*

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA nonstaff correspondent Senior Lieutenant A. Bystrov: "Greenpeace in Murmansk"]

[Excerpts] The world-renowned Greenpeace ship recently put in at Murmansk. Its crew members are described as nature's intrepid champions. This is indeed the case in many respects. [passage omitted]

Last year the brave Greenpeace deliberately entered the special 50-mile exclusion zone for a Trident missile test launch from a U.S. submarine and spoiled these tests.

"Of course we did not avoid conflict," the crew members said. "Two U.S. ships attacked and even rammed us. There was a huge hole here in the side."

"Do crew members have any intention of taking any protest action against Soviet warships during their time in the Barents Sea," I asked 29-year old Eleonora O'Hanlon, one of the coordinators of the "Nuclear-Free Seas" program.

"What do you mean?" she asked in amazement. "Although this cruise in the Arctic basin is part of our program, it would be rude to respond to the chance we have been given to visit Murmansk and get to know your people by taking action of any kind."

During this time, the Greenpeace was visited by hundreds of Murmansk residents. The vessel—58 meters long, maximum speed 14 knots—was built in the Netherlands in 1959. However it looks new as a result of the crew's endeavors. It has a helicopter and two rubber launches, and is very environmentally friendly.

The Greenpeace crew is international with seamen from 10 countries. Vladimir Sukhoparov is from the USSR. Many people know several languages in addition to their onboard speciality and have a scientific education—they include a biologist, an ichthyologist, a specialist in radioactive waste, and so on.

"We will achieve our program's final goal," Greenpeace Captain Ulrich Juergens reckons. "Not straightaway, but we will achieve it. We have already won some victories: France has put a stop to nuclear tests in the Pacific, Europe has adopted a ban on dumping toxic waste in the sea, and a ban has been imposed on the import of sealskins, and thus hunting is being restricted. So nothing is impossible."

## Worldwide Labor Group's Director Visits Moscow

### Received by Lukyanov 4 Oct

*LD0410144990 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 4 Oct 90*

[Text] Moscow October 4 TASS—Soviet parliament Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov today received Michel Hansenne, director-general of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). Hansenne is in Moscow on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The two men discussed ILO activities in elaborating international conventions and recommendations on the socio-economic position of the working people, and in extending USSR-ILO cooperation in labour legislation.

Lukyanov briefed Hansenne on the Soviet parliament's measures to ensure the social security of citizens in connection with the transition to a market economy. In particular, they expressed interest in an expert analysis by ILO of several Soviet bills regulating matters of labour, social security, health protection and employment.

Hansenne held substantive discussions today with Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the parliament Council of nationalities, and heads of several parliamentary committees and commissions.

### Confers With Gorbachev 5 Oct

*PM0910101390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1*

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With M. Hansenne"]

[Text] President Mikhail Gorbachev received director-general of the International Labor Organization (ILO) Michel Hansenne in the Kremlin on Friday. Hansenne's visit turns a new leaf in the development of relations

between this oldest authoritative organisation and the Soviet Union. This is also a sign of profound changes in the world and in Soviet society, Gorbachev said.

In view of the Soviet Union's transition to a market it is highly desirable to cooperate with the organization, which has accumulated vast international experience in the area of labor relations, democratization of economic structures of employment, social protection for the working people, and tripartite state-enterprise-worker relationship.

It is not enough to be open to accepting the experience of others, but it is also necessary to be prepared to implement it, Gorbachev said. It is particularly important to consider the specific features of a country with its traditions, history, psychology of its peoples, its level of development and potential and variety of its requirements. Only in this case the exchange of experience can be useful and take place at all. A mechanical transfer of foreign experience can only be harmful. The hopes of some in the West that the Soviet Union will do just that are in vain.

The readiness of ILO to widen cooperation with the Soviet Union at the present crucial stage of perestroyka is regarded as a manifestation of solidarity, a particularly valuable quality in the present times.

Hansenne invited the Soviet president to be a guest of honor at the ILO general conference in the summer of 1991 and to speak there to express his views of the world and his country's role in international development. The proposal was accepted in principle.

V.P. Shcherbakov, V.M. Morozov, J.-M. Serve [name as transliterated], and A.S. Chernyshev participated.

### Signs Joint Cooperation Accord

*LD0810221190 Moscow TASS in English 2133 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 9 TASS—The International Labour Organisation (ILO) signed an agreement with the Soviet Union here today to help it tackle social and labour problems during the transition to a market.

The document was signed by International Labour Office Director-General Michel Hansenne and chairman of the Soviet Committee on Labour and Social Issues Vladimir Shcherbakov.

ILO will help Soviet organisations of entrepreneurs and workers develop and implement structural reforms in order to ensure maximum protection for the people, Hansenne told TASS.

It will also give legal advice to the Soviet Government, he said.

"We have decided to allocate several hundred thousand dollars for the implementation of the agreement," he said.

Several computerised employment centres and social welfare centres will be set up in the Soviet Union.

### Gorbachev Receives Credentials From Ambassadors

*LD0410224190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1722 GMT 3 Oct 90*

[Text] Moscow, 3 Oct (TASS)—The credentials of Adolfo Evertz, ambassador of the Republic of Nicaragua; Salim Tadmuri, ambassador of the Republic of Lebanon; Girha Yilma, ambassador of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia; Dagfinn Stenseth, ambassador of the Republic of Norway; and Constant Koukoui, ambassador of the Republic of Benin, were received by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev in the Kremlin today.

After the credentials were received, conversations between Mikhail Gorbachev and new ambassadors took place.

### TASS Reports on Gremitskikh's 5 Oct Briefing

#### Shevardnadze Meeting on Gulf

*LD0510170290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1545 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow 5 Sep [date as received] (TASS)—Iraqi aggression and other problems of the Near East were the subject of discussion at a meeting on Thursday between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and foreign ministers of the Gulf Cooperation Council states of Oman, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and also the Bahraini representative at the United Nations. This was reported today at a briefing by Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate.

Eduard Shevardnadze, the Foreign Ministry spokesman reported, told the Arab ministers that Iraq's invasion and annexation of Kuwait is a fundamental issue for the Soviet Union. The Soviet minister noted that it is not only out of solidarity with the people of Kuwait which has been the victim of the expansionism of a major neighboring state that the USSR is acting so resolutely. It is a matter of whether success will be achieved in continuing the creation of a reliable and fair international order or whether the world will return to the "laws of the jungle" and the times of the cold war. According to Eduard Shevardnadze, what is now at stake is not just the fate of a single country but the future of the entire world community, which is undergoing a critical test. The unprecedented worldwide condemnation of Iraq's aggression and the unity of the permanent members of the UN Security Council, he noted, will serve as a

guarantee that the aggression will be halted. The minister stressed that the Soviet Union has made its choice and will follow it firmly and responsibly. He also noted the USSR's readiness to consult with the Arab countries of the Persian Gulf on all aspects regarding the development of the situation in the region.

Speaking on behalf of the council, its chairman, the Omani foreign minister, expressed gratitude for the principled line of the Soviet Union with respect to the events in the Persian Gulf which has guaranteed the international community's unprecedented unity of action.

### German Unification Speeches

*LD0510173190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1640 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 5 Oct (TASS)—The Soviet Union reacted with interest and attention to speeches by German leaders marking the country's unification and, above all, to the speech by President Richard von Weizsaecker at the festivities in Berlin and the government statement by Chancellor Helmut Kohl at the first plenary sitting of the all-German Bundestag. This was announced at a briefing today by Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate. There is satisfaction in the USSR over the German leaders' acknowledgement of the positive role played by the USSR in the process of German unification and of overcoming the division of the German nation, he noted, and also over their statements that German unity is part of the pan-European historical process. Regarding this Yuriy Gremitskikh singled out those remarks by the president and the chancellor about a united Germany having a solid contribution of its own to make to the process of forming a peaceful pan-European order, and to the cause of uniting Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that the USSR shares the view put forward by Helmut Kohl that Soviet-German relations "play a key role in pan-European responsibility" and that conditions have now been created to place them in a qualitatively new orbit.

"The statements by the German leaders are, in our view, of a realistic and considered nature," Yuriy Gremitskikh stressed. "They are forward-looking and geared toward creating an atmosphere of trust. This provides grounds for hoping that our countries, in accordance with the treaty on cooperation to be signed during the visit by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to Bonn, will interact closely and constructively in the cause of building the new Europe."

### Hungary's Goncz Visits Ukraine

*LD0510152590 Moscow TASS in English 1512 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow October 5 TASS—The more active role being played by Soviet republics supplements and enriches Soviet-Hungarian cooperation, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh said at a briefing here today. He answered journalists' questions about the results of the recent visit of President Arpad Goncz of Hungary to the Ukraine.

He stressed that the Ukraine and Hungary have traditionally maintained mutually beneficial relations, and their further development is fully in line with principles recorded in the Soviet Constitution. The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman welcomed the readiness, expressed in a joint statement, to deepen relations between the Ukraine and Hungary in the political, economic and humanitarian spheres, including in ensuring the rights of national minorities.

### Reduced Oil Supplies to CSFR

*LD0510145590 Moscow TASS in English 1413 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow October 5 TASS—The sharp fall in oil supplies to Czechoslovakia is due to falling production in the Soviet Union and its increasing reliance on hard currency in trade transactions, a Soviet spokesman told a briefing here today.

Speaking about the Soviet side's reaction to the Czechoslovak Government's proposal to hold high-level talks in Moscow to discuss oil supplies, Yuriy Gremitskikh said the proposal was closely studied and an appropriate answer would be forthcoming. He drew attention to "the Soviet side's readiness to openly and jointly discuss any issues and difficulties and to take whatever measures can be taken".

Gremitskikh stressed that the Soviet Union generally regarded relations with that country as rather important and wanted to have constructive and developed cooperation with Czechoslovakia.

### 'Breakthrough' on CSCE Security Issues Hailed

*PM0510094190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Oct 90 First Edition p 3*

[Article by observer Colonel M. Ponomarev under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Opinions": "Breakthrough"]

[Text] Anyone who has been to the northwestern regions of our country has certainly been struck by the huge

quantity of large and small stones around the perimeter of cultivated fields. These are traces of a glacial period in the history of our planet. As they descended from the uplands of the Scandinavian ice sheet the glaciers carried boulders, stones, and sand. And then when they melted as the climate became warmer, they left them cluttering the whole surface of the earth. And plowmen had to work hard in order to clear the ground and make it suitable for cultivation.

Something similar can be seen today in the political life of Europe, a continent where many extremely acute problems of our time are concentrated. The glaciers of the "cold war" have been cluttering it for four decades. And now that they have just left the fields of Europe, they have left behind them obstructions of large and small stones.

This is particularly noticeable now that there is a little over six weeks to go before the Paris meeting. The summit meeting of leaders of the CSCE states. The date of the conference has only just been finally decided—19-21 November. This decision was adopted Tuesday at the meeting of the CSCE countries' foreign ministers in New York.

Considerable obstacles had to be overcome before this decision was adopted. Probably the main one was a menacing relic of the period of confrontation and "cold war"—the mountains of weapons stockpiled on the continent. Representatives of the Warsaw Pact and NATO states spent much effort at their meetings in Vienna seeking ways to considerably decrease these mountains, if not get rid of them entirely. And considerable speculation about this appeared in the world press, including certain Soviet press organs. Pessimists claimed that the so-called "sufficiency problem"—the quantity of tanks, armored vehicles, helicopters, and artillery that the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries could retain—was insoluble, accusing the Soviet Union of refusing to compromise and of making unduly high demands. They also doubted whether it would be possible to reach consensus about the "zones problem"—a regional division in Europe precluding the possibility of a dangerous concentration of arms in a single region and ensuring a balance of forces. Another stumbling block at the Vienna talks was the problem of aircraft or, to be more precise, the question of whether the USSR's land-based naval aviation and the U.S. naval aviation based on aircraft carriers off the shores of Europe should be included in the total strength.

These are not invented problems. They really existed and partially continue to exist even today. But it is well known that the reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe is of key importance for creating a new international security system. President G. Bush figuratively called this the "cornerstone" of such a system. And solutions were found—during meetings between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. President and secretary of state in the last few days in New York and at the meeting there among the foreign ministers of all the Warsaw Pact member states.

The specific accords on questions concerning the level of sufficiency and the zones problem are still not being spelled out. Clearly, the participants in the talks deem it necessary to finalize the text of the agreement unhindered by insufficiently competent critics. As for aircraft, it appears that the solution here is a judgment of Solomon, maybe not the best solution but the only possible one today: to remove this question from the purview of the talks at the present stage to reach an agreement on it at the ensuing stage. Incidentally, there has already been a precedent for this. That was how the USSR and the United States approached the issue of long-range sea-launched cruise missiles when preparing the treaty radically reducing strategic offensive arms. (In order to avoid returning again to this topic, I will say straightaway that progress on the question of strategic offensive arms was also achieved in New York. It was noted that there is a chance of completing work on this treaty before the end of the current year, and then it will be possible to agree the date of G. Bush's visit to the USSR, during which this treaty will be signed.)

It can also be claimed that work on preparing the other documents that are to be signed at the summit in Paris is also going successfully. The structure of a modern system of European security has emerged. The idea of creating a center for the prevention and resolution of conflicts entrusted with the task of dealing with both military and political aspects of security has been approved. It is planned to form an all-European parliamentary forum. The machinery for regular political consultations at various levels—state leaders, foreign ministers, and their special representatives—is being prepared. If decisions are adopted about this, a new atmosphere sharply different from the atmosphere of "cold war" times will emerge in Europe.

A contribution to this will be made by the declaration on relations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries, which is also to be examined at the November summit. The document is now being prepared on the basis of drafts submitted by the Soviet Union, the 16 members of the Atlantic alliance, and Hungary.

I think that the fact that those who are preparing the Paris meeting are concerned not only with current affairs and problems, no matter how important and complex they may be in themselves, is very important. After all, stones are removed from the fields not so that the fields can merely be clear, but so that they can be plowed and sown and eventually produce a harvest. The process is important in itself, of course. But the main thing is the result. And if we are to speak of this result in the political plane, it is stability and security for all Europe's peoples and the opportunity to cooperate in mutually advantageous interests.

This is why the elaboration of the main guidelines for the future development of the Helsinki process and the

preparation of the next summit meeting of the CSCE states—"Helsinki-2"—is beginning right now. These guidelines are to be defined in Paris. They are called upon to point the way to still more radical changes for the better in the political climate of Europe. One of these guidelines is the second stage of the talks on conventional forces and arms in Europe, at which solutions must be found to the problems remaining unsolved during the first stage and the first steps must be taken along this road. It is also proposed to begin talks on eliminating tactical nuclear weapons.

Here I have to mention, if only briefly, the Soviet-U.S. joint statement "Responsibility for Peace and Security in a Changing World," which was adopted yesterday. It emphasizes that we are experiencing the period of the most profound changes in international affairs since World War II. Relations of confrontation between East and West are giving way to cooperation and partnership. The United Nations is rapidly becoming a genuine center for coordinated joint action, and the Security Council is regaining its decisive role in maintaining international security, in the peaceful settlement of disputes, and in preventing conflicts. In the United Nations and its specialized institutions and programs the USSR and the United States will attach special importance to seeking practical and multifaceted solutions to questions of international peace and security and to political, economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian problems.

The success achieved in recent days during the bilateral and multilateral meetings in New York and at the meeting of foreign ministers from the CSCE countries can, without any doubt, be described as a genuine breakthrough. The gloomy forecasts of the pessimists have not been borne out. The political will of the leaders of the European states, the United States, and Canada ensured this breakthrough. It is all the more significant in that it was made at such a difficult and complex time, when Iraq is not abandoning the annexation of Kuwait and the Persian Gulf region is increasingly becoming a powder keg that may blow up not only the Near East but the whole world. The leaders of most countries are now occupied with problems connected with this conflict. The foreign ministers of the CSCE countries could not ignore them either, and adopted a special statement at their meeting in New York.

The processes taking place in individual states also exert a substantial influence on the sphere of international life. There is no need to dwell in detail on what is happening in our country—the press, radio, and television incessantly tell us about this and we ourselves run up against it in our daily lives. But it should not be forgotten that other countries are also experiencing serious domestic problems. Thus the United States is faced with an unprecedented budget deficit. For the first time in many years, despite the Republicans' election promises, it has been forced to make a considerable increase in taxes.

It also cannot be forgotten that the stereotypes of the past not only live on but are still the mode of thinking for a very great many people. Here is just one example. An international symposium on the future of NATO has just been held in Madrid. Moreover, certain speeches clearly sounded notes of the cobwebbed bloc approach—maintain vigilance, delay "perestroyka within NATO," and take advantage of the situation in order to "strengthen the West's defenses."

In these conditions what has been achieved on the threshold of the Paris meeting is particularly significant. It is also significant that the problem of reducing conventional and nuclear missile arms is not receding into the background. It remains among the first items on the agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations and international relations in general.

## United States & Canada

### Shevardnadze, Baker Continue Talks in New York

#### Meet 5 Oct

*LD0510191390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1840 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Menkes and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] United Nations, 5 Oct (TASS)—The latest working meeting between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker got under way in New York today. This is their fourth meeting in New York in the past week and a half.

As the ministers told journalists earlier, the answers to a number of key questions concerned with talks on concluding a strategic offensive weapons treaty have to be found at today's meeting. All issues to do with an agreement on cutting conventional weapons in Europe as an essential condition for the pan-European summit meeting this November in Paris also have to finally be resolved.

Replying in advance of the meeting to journalists' questions as to whether this work can be completed today, the ministers suggested waiting for the end of the meeting. As Eduard Shevardnadze said, we are in serious mood, otherwise we would not have bothered to meet four times.

#### Discuss Arms Reductions

*LD0610042690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] On Friday evening, the New York round of talks between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker concluded. Later they issued a statement on the results of the dialogue. The ministers reported that solutions were found to all of the problems of the Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional arms in Europe. That is, the path is open for the conclusion of a treaty and, therefore, also for the successful holding of a meeting of the leaders of the European states, the United States, and Canada in November. The prospects for signing a treaty on the radical reduction of strategic offensive weapons by the end of the year have become quite realistic. Shevardnadze and Baker agreed to meet again in Washington in November.

#### Shevardnadze Departs 5 Oct

*LD0610045490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0426 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] UN, 6 Oct (TASS)—Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze left New York for Moscow on Friday evening. As head of the Soviet delegation, he took part in the work of the 45th session of the UN General Assembly and also in the meeting of foreign ministers of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

### Defense Minister Moiseyev Continues U.S. Visit

#### 'Cordial' Reception Noted

*PM0810100390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 5*

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Nadein: "Official Framework Close: General Moiseyev Receives Cordial Welcome in United States"]

[Text] Washington—A group of economists who drew up the "500 Days" program recently arrived in Washington, Academician Shatalin is now here, Kasparov and Karpov are getting ready for their match in New York.... In short, a lot of visitors. However, none of them—except, of course, for Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, who heads the USSR delegation at the UN General Assembly session—is receiving as much attention from the press as the visit by Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the Soviet Army General Staff, which has started here.

General Moiseyev has come at the invitation of Colin Powell, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee.

The constant articles about the rumors of a possible military coup circulating in Moscow lend special interest to the visit in the eyes of the public here. The latest issue of TIME notably devoted a major article to this, even after Eduard Shevardnadze roundly rejected such a likelihood in a television interview.

In the United States, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the highest military official—as distinct from the secretary of defense, who is purely a civilian. The chief of the Soviet General Staff is seen in analogous terms here and is accorded a decisive place in our Army hierachy. However, the press does cite the Soviet press regarding differences between the military and diplomats on the question of a sufficient level of armaments, and also excerpts from public speeches by the chief of the General Staff remarks containing reminders of the "imperialist threat" and objections to the creation of a professional army in the USSR.

The content of the talks that have started remains secret, but the friendly spirit and atmosphere of mutual understanding between the two generals has become public knowledge. It is noted, in particular, that Moiseyev is the first Soviet official to have laid a wreath at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

The meeting between Moiseyev and President Bush Wednesday was planned as a protocol courtesy visit. Such meetings in the White House are traditionally brief, no more than five minutes.

But this time the conversation—in which, in addition to Bush, Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney, Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, former General Brent Scowcroft, assistant to the president for national security affairs, and Vice President Dan Quayle, took part—lasted more than 30 minutes. Even allowing for the fact that discussion was conducted via an interpreter, this deviation from established White House practice is regarded as significant by local observers.

Although the details of the conversation have not been divulged, White House officials have made it clear that Moiseyev expressed undoubted support for the growing cooperation between Gorbachev and Bush on the part of the Soviet military.

It is not yet known whether the general will give a news conference at the end of his visit. Previous visits by top military leaders and members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Defense and State Security Committee have not supplied the public with detailed information on the practical results of such contacts.

### Sees Air, Naval Bases

*LD0510143990 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS special correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] San Diego, California October 5 TASS—Head of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff General Mikhail Moiseyev, who is also first deputy defence minister, on Thursday continued his tour of the United States.

He watched San Francisco from a helicopter, visited several warships, a submarine and a Pacific Marines training centre at San Diego, the U.S. largest Naval base on the Pacific coast, and a U.S. Navy air base on North Island.

Before his return to Washington on Friday, Moiseyev is expected to visit the Peterson Air Base in Colorado and view from a helicopter Colorado Springs, where the U.S. Air Force Academy is situated, and the Pike's Peak. He will also visit an underground complex of the North American Air Defence Command (NORAD) near Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Throughout his tour, Moiseyev is being accompanied by chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell, who invited the Soviet general to the U.S. on an official visit.

### Holds News Conference

*LD0610090590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2205 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS special correspondents Stanislav Lunev and Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Excerpts] Washington, 6 Oct (TASS)—Army General A. Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and first deputy USSR minister of defense, concluded his trip around the United States yesterday. That day he visited Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado Springs (Colorado), flew by helicopter over the location of the USSR Air Force Academy and Pikes Peak and visited the underground complex of the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD) in Cheyenne (Colorado).

Upon arriving in the U.S. capital, Army General M.A. Moiseyev gave a joint news conference in the Pentagon with General Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces. In his speech he thanked the U.S. side for the hospitality shown him and briefed American and foreign journalists about his meetings and talks with American representatives.

As Army General M.A. Moiseyev stressed, among other things, the question of developing further contacts between our countries through military channels was solved, and a plan of contacts between the Armed Forces of the USSR and the United States for 1991-1992 was brought into action during his visit. As a result of an exchange of views, the sides confirmed that the agreement on averting dangerous military incidents between the Armed Forces of the USSR and the United States is working normally. The matter of possibly organizing joint military and scientific research and ways of ensuring stability, security, and measures of trust after the deep cuts in strategic offensive weapons and conventional armed forces in Europe were discussed.

There was an exchange of views on the situation in the Persian Gulf area, as a result of which the sides came to the conclusion that the meeting USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President G. Bush in Helsinki and their decision to seek a political outcome to the crisis in the Near East were of exceptional importance. During the discussion of the state of affairs at the disarmament talks the sides agreed that there is a need to look more quickly for a solution to unresolved issues so as to prepare an agreement to cut strategic offensive weapons and conventional armed forces in Europe by the end of 1990.

Army General M.A. Moiseyev noted that the Soviet Union expects the United States to take into account concerns about naval forces. In our opinion, a situation in which all types of the sides' armed forces are the subject of talks and cuts, and the naval forces are untouchable, is not normal. Talks need to be started on naval armaments, at least, very soon. It is essential to renew, without delay, the talks on a total end to nuclear weapons testing.

Speaking at the news conference, General C. Powell pointed to the importance of further developing and improving the entire complex of Soviet-U.S. relations, including contacts through military channels. In this connection he highly valued the visit to the United States of Army General M.A. Moiseyev and provided the

information that he had accepted an invitation from the chief of the general staff of the USSR Armed Forces to visit the Soviet Union.

A reception was organized in the USSR Embassy yesterday in honour of Army General M.A. Moiseyev. [passage omitted] That evening, Army General M.A. Moiseyev left the United State. He was seen off at Andrews Air Force Base— near Washington, D.C.—by General C. Powell and other American military leaders.

### Concludes Visit

*LD0610222590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The visit to the United States of Army General Moiseyev, head of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and first deputy minister of defense, has ended. In Washington he held a joint news conference at the Pentagon with General Powell, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. In his address the Soviet military leader stressed, among other things, that during his visit a number of questions on the development of further military contacts between the USSR and United States were resolved. There had also been an exchange of opinion about the situation in the Persian Gulf area.

## Joint U.S. News Conference Held at UN

*LD0510084390 Moscow TASS in English 0757 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Text] United Nations October 5 TASS—A joint Soviet-U.S. news conference was held at U.N. headquarters on Thursday. Speakers included Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy and U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for International Organisations John Bolton.

They emphasised the importance of the joint Soviet-U.S. statement "responsibility for peace and security in the changing world" adopted by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on October 3.

Bolton said that a chain of events have taken place over the last year after the U.N. General Assembly adopted the first joint Soviet-U.S. resolution. These events deepened and broadened cooperation between the two countries on problems concerning the United Nations.

Bolton singled out the agreement on Cambodia, elaborated by the five permament members of the U.N. Security Council, further progress in the quest for ways to settle the situation in Afghanistan and also joint work on a host of Security Council resolutions in view of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

According to Bolton, the Soviet-U.S. statement culminates the two countries' activity at the United Nations in the last year. It demonstrates to the governments of other U.N. member-countries that the United States and the USSR "have no hidden agenda", Bolton stressed.

The agenda outlined by the joint statement covers an array of issues ranging from traditional military-political to relatively new ones such as environmental protection, narcotics and terrorism, Petrovskiy said. The Iraq-Kuwait crisis prompted a new sense of responsibility for peace and a new international consensus that unites all peoples on the basis of observance of the U.N. Charter.

In this regard, the joint Soviet-U.S. statement will be an important contribution to efforts to revive the United Nations and turn this organisation into a unique world centre of concerted actions, Petrovskiy said.

## Joint U.S. Stock Market Seminar Opens

*LD0910014190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[Report by Aleksandr Kuzin]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The first Soviet-U.S. seminar on stock exchanges and their role in the formation of financial markets began its work in Moscow today. Our corresondent Aleksandr Kuzin reports:

[Kuzin] In Leonid Abalkin's opinion, this joint Soviet-U.S. seminar is an important and concrete step on the USSR's way toward creating its own securities market. Specialists from various financial institutions and industrial enterprises in our country are taking part in the seminar along with prominent scientist-economists. From the U.S. side, the seminar has been initiated by the New York Stock Exchange. [passage omitted]

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov addressed participants of the meeting with a congratulatory message today. It is noted in the message that the first Soviet-U.S. seminar on issues of creating a stock exchange and securities market in the Soviet Union reflects one more promising sphere of mutually beneficial cooperation in the complex of relations between the USSR and United States.

## Canadian Communist Party Congress Greeted

*LD0410223990 Moscow TASS in English 2145 GMT 4 Oct 90*

[Text] Moscow October 5 TASS—The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat sent greetings to delegates to the 28th congress of the Canadian Communist Party, wishing them success in their work.

"The traditionally warm relations between our two parties will continue to expand in the interest of mutual understanding and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Canada and goodneighbourly relations and solidarity between our peoples," the message, circulated here on Thursday [4 October] said.

## China

### PRC Foreign Economic Minister Visits

#### Received by Ryzhkov

*LD0510152390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] On 5 October, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received in the Kremlin Zheng Tuobin, minister of foreign economic relations and trade of the PRC, who is in the Soviet Union as the head of a Chinese delegation for talks on issues relating to trade and economic cooperation and to sign a trade agreement between the USSR and PRC. During a detailed conversation, both sides gave a high appraisal of the results of wide and dynamic cooperation between the USSR and PRC in all spheres, and especially after the summit that was held in Beijing and the visit to the Soviet Union by the State Council premier. The current issues of mutual trade, and above all, the increase in deliveries from the PRC to the USSR of some foodstuffs and raw materials for their production were discussed.

#### Trade Agreement Discussed

*PM0910100590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1*

[TASS report: "Talks in Kremlin"]

[Text] On 5 October, N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received in the Kremlin Zheng Tuobin, PRC minister of foreign economic relations and trade, who is in the USSR at the head of a Chinese delegation for talks on questions of trade and economic cooperation and to sign a trade agreement between the USSR and the PRC.

In the course of thorough talks both sides made a high assessment of the results of broad and dynamic cooperation between the USSR and the PRC in all spheres, particularly since the summit meeting in Beijing and the visit by the premier of the PRC State Council to the Soviet Union. The sides noted with satisfaction that the process of transferring to a practical plane the accords reached during those meetings is, on the whole, proceeding successfully. Attention was drawn to the fact that the switch to the use of the market mechanism in the sphere of bilateral economic ties, which is envisaged from the beginning of 1991, will ensure in practice their higher qualitative parameters and strict discipline of reciprocal deliveries on the basis of a balance of the sides' interests. Current questions of mutual trade and, above all, of increasing deliveries of certain foodstuffs and the raw materials for their production from the PRC to the USSR were also discussed.

N.I. Ryzhkov thoroughly illumined the profound changes occurring in the USSR in the process of the political and economic reforms and spoke about the progress in preparing the program of transition to a socially oriented market economy and its integration in the world economic system. He described the USSR Government's approach to fundamental problems of the restructuring of economic relations in the country, emphasizing that every step in this direction requires considered decisions taking account of the people's interests.

The talks passed in a businesslike and comradely atmosphere. Participating in them were Yu.D. Maslyukov, K.F. Katushev, and also Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR.

#### Agreement Signed

*PM0510131990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Agreement Signed"]

[Text] Soviet-Chinese trade talks were held in Moscow on 2 October and resulted in the signing of an intergovernmental trade agreement and a protocol regulating accounts and payments. These envisage the transition to accounting in freely convertible currency in trade and economic relations between the USSR and the PRC as of 1991. The documents were signed for the Soviet side by K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, and for the Chinese side by Zheng Tuobin, PRC minister of foreign economic relations and trade.

#### Meets With Leningrad Official

*OW0510221490 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1200 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] The Chinese delegation headed by Zheng Tuobin, minister of foreign economic relations and trade, continues its visit in the USSR. The delegation is in the USSR for negotiations on promoting Soviet-Chinese trade.

The Chinese visitors met with personnel from Leningrad's industrial circles yesterday. Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Leningrad Oblast Party Committee, received the delegation at the Smolny Palace. He briefed the Chinese visitors on the theory of establishing a free trade zone in Leningrad.

### Scientific Conference on Ties With China Held

*PM0810105990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[Report by V. Ganshin: "Scientific Conference"]

[Text] A scientific conference on "The Development of Economic Ties Between the USSR and the PRC" was held at the USSR Academy of Sciences Far East Institute 2-3 October. A representative delegation of Chinese scientists and leading scientific staffers of the Institute of Economics, the Institute of the USSR and the Countries of East Europe, and the Academy of Social Sciences of China took part in the conferennce.

The close interconnection between the cooperation between the two countries and the economic reforms being carried out in them was the main topic of attention. It was noted that Soviet-Chinese ties as a whole are developing dynamically. In 1981-1989 reciprocal commodity turnover increased 13-fold: The Soviet Union has moved to fifth place in China's foreign trade. Border trade alone last year came to more than $800 million. However, the results achieved do not match the two countries' potential by a long way.

In discussing the state of Soviet-Chinese economic relations and the basic areas of their further development the meeting participants proceeded from the premise that these ties are entering a new phase. One of the main differences of this new phase is the growing economic autonomy of the union republics and the autonomous formations and regions of the USSR. Another distinctive feature of the new phase is the upcoming switch from 1991 of foreign trade transactions in Soviet-Chinese trade to world prices and the settlement of these transactions in freely convertible currency. Given this, a certain reduction in the size of bilateral economic ties can be expected.

The conference discussed measures which could counter this adverse trend. These included the more vigorous development of scientific and technical exchange, production sharing, joint ventures, and so forth.

## Northeast Asia

### Reports Continue on Kurils Debate With Japan

#### Return of Islands Said Planned

*PM0710185990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 8*

[REUTER report under the general heading "IZVESTIYA Wireroom": "ASAHI Report"]

[Text] On Sunday the Japanese mass media, in particular ASAHI SHIMBUN and the KYODO agency, were reporting that during the eminent guest's historic visit to Japan next April, USSR President M. Gorbachev is expected to offer to return to Japan two Pacific islands which the latter regards as belonging to it.

ASAHI SHIMBUN stresses that a message from the Soviet Government to the leader of Japan's ruling party speaks of the USSR's readiness to return to its 1956 proposal on returning to Japan two of the four islands of the Kuril chain which were joined to the USSR at the end of World War II.

#### Plan Could Facilitate Peace Treaty

*LD0710230890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Japanese sources report the USSR is ready to return to Japan two of the four islands that are the subject of territorial disputes.

The Shikotan and Habomais islands could be returned to Japan between two and five years.

ASAHI SHIMBUN reports that such a suggestion was made by Moscow back in 1956. Return of the islands could facilitate signing of the peace treaty with Japan, as well as this country's more active participation in economic cooperation with the Soviet Union.

#### Ministry Denies Changed Stance

*LD0810105990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1006 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Olog Polovko]

[Text] Moscow, 8 Sep [date as received] (TASS)—The USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs has not passed on new proposals to the Japanese side regarding the "northern territories," which are the subject of a long-running dispute between the Soviet Union and Japan, TASS has learned.

In response today to a request from TASS correspondents to comment on the statement made yesterday by Shintaro Abe, a prominent figure in the Liberal Democratic Party which is in power in Japan, on the willingness supposedly expressed by the USSR to hand Shikotan and the Habomais, two islands of the Kuril ridge, over to Japan, a senior Soviet diplomat said that this statement does not correspond to reality. He also stated that at present the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs is preparing a denial of this.

This statement by a spokesman of the USSR Foreign Ministry echoes an interview given to LITERATURNAYA GAZETA last week by Yevgeniy Primakov, member of the USSR Presidential Council. In particular, he described as "illusory" hopes that during his coming visit to Japan the USSR president will resolve vexed issues with that neighboring counry by means of a unilateral reunciation of previous positions.

Yevgeniy Primakov expressed the opinion that a quest to solve the problem of "the northern territories," which is still deadlocking the development of Soviet-Japanese relations, should be sought not in a renunciation of positions, but in a wide-ranging exchange of opinions by the parties on other issues, such as, for example, joint economic activity in various forums and, possibly, certain military- political aspects.

#### Shevardnadze Issues Denial

*OW0810161990 Tokyo KYODO in English 1536 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[Text] Moscow, Oct. 8 KYODO—The Soviet Union on Monday denied making any fresh proposal on the return

to Japan of two of four Soviet-held islands, saying there is no change in Moscow's position that the Kuril Islands belong to the Soviet Union.

Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said the Soviet Union has not put forth any new proposal over the territorial problem, either in writing or orally.

Shevardnadze told KYODO news service that Japanese reports to the contrary are wrong.

Prominent conservative Japanese politician Shintaro Abe and his top aide, Hiroshi Mitsuzuka, said in Japan on Sunday that the Soviet Union has proposed concluding a basic agreement governing relations between Japan and the Soviet Union.

The proposed agreement calls for reconfirming the 1956 Japan-Soviet joint declaration, in which Moscow agrees to return two of the four disputed islands, Shikotan and the Habomais, they said.

Abe said Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev hopes to sign the accord in April when he visits Tokyo.

Mitsuzuka said the Soviet Union filed the proposal with him while he was in Moscow as a member of a mission sent by Japan's ruling Liberal Democratic Party [LDP] in September.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry issued a statement denying Japanese press reports regarding the return of the disputed islands.

The Soviet statement said "Japanese officials were allegedly handed a package of agreements which expressed the readiness of the Soviet side to hand over to Japan two of the four southern Kurile Islands."

"The information, distributed by KYODO TSUSHIN (news service), does not correspond to reality, since recently, including during the visit to Moscow by the LDP delegation, the Japanese side, including parliamentary deputies and their accompanying officials, were handed no draft documents, let alone documents that would raise in any form the question of the Kurile Islands, which belong to the Soviet Union."

Meanwhile, the official TASS news agency also said, "the Soviet Foreign Ministry has not made any new proposals to Japan concerning the northern territories, which have long been disputed by the two countries."

"A statement on Sunday by Shintaro Abe.... Suggested that the Soviet Union had expressed readiness to transfer to Japan two of the Kurile Islands—Shikotan and Habomai. However, a senior Soviet diplomat has told TASS that the statement did not reflect the facts."

Soviet Presidential Council member Yevgeniy Primakov, in an interview with the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA newspaper, described as illusory hopes that the Soviet president was going to solve the dispute during his forthcoming visit to Japan by renouncing his former position, TASS said.

"Primakov said that a way out of the dispute around the northern territories, which has left Soviet-Japanese relations in deadlock, should be sought not in the reunification of present positions but in a broad-scale exchange between the two countries on other issues, such as joint economic activity in a variety of forms and, possibly, some military-political aspects."

Shikotan and the Habomais are two of the four islands at issue, located east of Japan's northernmost main island of Hokkaido. The other two are Etorofu and Kunashiri.

Japan has long called for the package return of the four islands, which the Soviet Union seized immediately after Japan's surrender to the allied powers in August 1945.

Speaking at an LDP factional seminar at the hot springs resort of Hakone, Kanagawa Prefecture, on Sunday, former Foreign Minister Abe called the reported fresh Soviet initiative "a very important proposal. The government and the governing party must tackle it together to resolve the pending bilateral issue."

Abe was scheduled to visit Moscow in September for talks with Gorbachev but was forced to stay at home because of illness.

The Soviet proposal, which would govern the basic Japanese-Soviet relationship, calls for confirming the 1956 Japan-Soviet joint declaration establishing bilateral diplomatic ties, under which the Soviet Union vowed to return Shikotan and the Habomais to Japan, Abe and Mitsuzuka said.

It also reportedly calls for conclusion of a Japanese-Soviet peace treaty three to five years after the two countries sign the basic accord.

The proposed draft agreement also urges Japan and the Soviet Union to fulfill their respective roles and responsibilities toward stability and development of international society, the two men said.

It also calls for expanding personnel exchanges and for promoting mutual efforts to help Soviet economic reform programs.

Mitsuzuka, also a former foreign minister and Abe's chief of staff, said at the seminar that an aide to Gorbachev suddenly summoned him on September 24 when he was in Moscow as a member of the LDP delegation and conveyed the seven-point proposal orally as a message to Abe.

Mitsuzuka did not identify the official but said he was a senior official ranked below Presidential Council status. The official assured him the proposal had been approved by the Soviet leadership, Mitsuzuka said.

The Soviet offer was sent to Abe in a formal document in early October and the same proposal will be sent to the Japanese Foreign Ministry soon, Mitsuzuka said.

### Reports Called 'Disinformation'

*LD0810121690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1132 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[By TASS political observer Yuriy Tyssovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 8 Oct (TASS)—The KYODO TSUSIN [as received] agency has put out a "sensational" report citing "Japanese" political sources it asserts the Soviet Union "has come out with a new initiative aimed at developing friendly relations with Japan, having expressed readiness to return to Japan two of the four islands of the Kuriles chain," namely Shikotan and Habomai. To make it the more convincing, details are added: The proposal was allegedly made through USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs channels in the course of negotiations in Moscow last month with a delegation of the Japanese ruling Liberal Democratic Party. This report elicited an instant response from Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu and Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama, that is, the report was at once raised to the highest official level.

The USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to which the TASS observer turned for an explanation, expressed bewilderment in this regard, stressing that no such "initiatives" had been put forward by the Soviet side.

So, it is a routine piece of "disinformation." Not the first, indeed, and possibly not the last. About a year ago the American press also wrote about "secret Soviet messages" to the Japanese Government proposing a handover of the four islands in return for large-scale investments in our country's economy. It is not a matter of money, however. At the basis of the Soviet position on the southern part of the Kurile ridge there lies a fundamental consideration: The islands belong to our country and our ownership has been confirmed by the principles and norms of modern international law and set down in the decisions of the 1945 Yalta Conference. These decisions, indeed, are binding not only for the victor countries, but also for Japan, as the subject of the Yalta agreement. Thus, Tokyo's claims cannot have a legal basis either from this point of view, or from a historical one.

Certain circles in Japan, who use the Japanese national colors for the Kurils on maps, obviously find it profitable to keep this problem as an irritant in Soviet-Japanese relations. It is more sensible to choose another way, however, that of untying the whole knot of problems of bilateral links in an all-around way and concluding a peace treaty. Then to go back to the problem of the "northern territories" without the unnecessary prejudices and old stereotypes. As E.A. Shevardnadze, the USSR minister of foreign affairs stressed recently, there are "very many interesting" alternatives for solving this problem to the satisfaction of both sides.

## DPRK Reaction to ROK-USSR Ties Eyed

### 'High Emotion Persists'

*LD0610011990 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Commentary by Oleg Shchedrov]

[Text] High emotion persists in North Korea over establishment of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Seoul. Items have appeared in the Pyongyang press that openly accuse the Soviet Union of helping to perpetuate the split of the Korean peninsula. How well grounded are these accusations? A story from our commentator Oleg Shchedrov:

The establishment of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Seoul is quite a logical move. South Korea is among the most advanced Far Eastern countries economically. This factor must be taken into account by all means. Besides that the dynamic development of Soviet-South Korean trade has simply required in the past two years clarity in the relations between the two countries. And so, the advantages of the move taken by Moscow and Seoul were obvious. But, is it possible that Pyongyang is right to claim that with the practical advantages Moscow has got have helped to perpetuate the division of the Korean peninsula? [sentence as heard] Are we dealing with another case of double standards?

Well, indeed, a group of two leading Japanese political parties have just visited North Korea. It is clear from the fiscal communique [as heard] that a line has been taken to quickly restore diplomatic relations between the two countries. In this instance Pyongyang seems not to bother that Tokyo is a key ally of Seoul and, by the logic used with regards to the Soviet Union, such recognition should also be considered as a departure from the principles, and so on. But then, apart from the mutual recriminations and accusations, there is recognition of realities that exist on the Korean peninsula, and this recognition affects the prospects of reconciliation between the two parts of the peninsula.

I may remind you that the most important event in the political life on the Korean peninsula in the past few weeks was the first ever meeting between the prime ministes of the two states. This is a major shift from the confrontation to a dialogue. Another thing is clear: The accumulated burden of mutual distrust and enmity is so large that the continued constructive dialogue between North and South will require not only restraint and wisdom from their leaders but also substantial international cooperation. And this cooperation can be effective only if there are diversified ties between [word indistinct] Pyongyang and Seoul, and the rest of the world. A bridge cannot rest only on one side. That is the basic idea of the proposed criss-cross recognition by Moscow and Beijing of Seoul, and by Washington and tokyo of Pyongyang. It is hardly possible to see any evil designs behind that.

### Seen as Effort To Split Koreas

*LD0710004990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Report by Pyongyang correspondent Konstantin Belov]

[Text] ] It seems that the DPRK intends to abandon its demand that the concrete wall that is built in the south along the demarcation line, and which divides the peninsula into north and south, be destroyed. Perhaps very soon it wil be down to putting up its own iron wall. I have discoveed the signs of this on Friday in an observer's article of the newspaper NODONG SINMUN, the organ of the Central Committee of the Labor Party of Korea. I quote: Carrying this banner high [word indistinct], moving forward, believing in victory, and swerving not in the face of any storms, our people will stand up like an iron wall to defend their socialist base, and they will definitely attain the goal of unification of their homeland. The article entitled Diplomatic Relations Is the Object of Sale and Purchase for Dollars reflects the official reaction of Pyongyang to the fact that on 30 September, the USSR and the Republic of Korea established diplomatic relations. The foreign representatives accredited here had to wait two days longer than usual for the official reaction.

Generally, the accepted thing in the DPRK is to inform the public about important international events on the third day. For example, the public here found out about the reunification of Germany only on Friday. It would seem that because of the extra time, they had to think their reaction should have been more considered and realistic. But regrettably this has not happened.

The article by the anonymous observer has been written in a very emotional style, and contains insolent attacks and threats against the supreme leaders of our country and the USSR as a whole. Of all the furious accusations of the NODONG SINMUN observer, I would like to single out the most important one in my view. I quote:

The establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and South Korea cannot be viewed as other than an open involvement in the main strategy of the United States, which is striving to preserve the situation of a split Korea, to isolate us from the international community, to get us to open the gates and to overthrow the socialist system in our country—end of quote.

This accusation patently reflects the fear of the DPRK leadership for the future of its unique regime. And it is prepared, it seems to me, to condemn its people to even greater isolation from the external world in order to preserve the status quo in that country. This is why I thought the passage about the iron wall, with which the NODONG SINMUN observer concluded his article about the diplomatic relations between Moscow and Seoul, to be significant.

### DPRK Daily Calls Ties 'Betrayal'

*SK0710233290 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[From "Asian News" program under "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] NODONG SINMUN yesterday carried a commentary on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and ROK.

The organ of the Central Committee of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] wrote the DPRK's first reaction to this event. The paper considers this event a betrayal. According to the paper, this event means the recognition of the existence of two Koreas. The editorial states that this event violates the treaty on friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance signed between the DPRK and the Soviet Union and that the Soviet Unions, together with the United States, is responsible for having divided Korea into two at the 38th Parallel after World War II.

The paper also claims that the current change in the situation shows that the Soviet Union is attempting to (?justify) its act and [word indistinct] and will bring about the destruction of the balance of power on the Korean peninsula, will aggravate confrontation between the North and the South, and will cause an arms race.

The paper calls preparations for the establishment of the USSR-ROK diplomatic relations a product of the USSR-U.S. conspiracy and says that because of this, the direction of a new [word indistinct] is being revealed and that ideological secession will be caused in the international relations which the Soviet Union actively is pursuing.

In pointing out that Seoul decided to offer loans to the Soviet Union, the organ of the WPK claims that the Soviet Union sold its dignity, as well as the interests and trust of its allies, thus (?losing) its prestige as the great power of socialism.

### DPRK Rebuff Called 'Regrettable'

*LD0510172490 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS analyst Aleksandr Zhebin]

[Text] Moscow October 5 TASS—The normalisation of relations between a number of countries, which for various reasons were frozen or even cancelled altogether, is one of the positive aspects of the present normalisation of the world situation.

The decision of the Soviet Union and South Korea to establish diplomatic relations was welcomed by officials and the general public in most countries precisely in this spirit.

Making their decisions to normalise bilateral relations, Moscow and Seoul stressed that this move must not and will not be to the detriment of third countries' interests. This pledge was recorded in their joint communique.

"The Soviet Union," Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard shevardnadze noted, "intends to continue to develop traditional relations of friendship and good-neighbourliness with North Korea. It (?will cooperate) with the Korean Democratic People's Republic in the international arena and assist in every possible way the peaceful unification of two Koreas".

In this light, Pyongyang's reaction to the normalisation of the Soviet-South Korean relations appears regrettable. An article published today in the NODON SINMUN newspaper, the organ of the Korean Labour Party Central Committee, says that this move "is at variance with the cause of Korean unification" and "will most likely lead to" the aggravation of confrontation between the North and the South, an arms race and an extreme exacerbation of the situation on the Korean peninsula.

Judging by Pyongyang's official statements, North Korea favours the normalisation of the situation on and around the peninsula and the solution of problems facing the two Koreas through dialogue. However, even after the first-ever talks between the heads of the South and North Korean governments in early September, Pyongyang continues to "ignore" the existence of the other state on the Korean peninsula.

### DPRK Fears Dismissed

*PM0810141990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Oct 90 First Edition p 5*

[Commentary by A. Matveyev: "Commentator's Opinion": "In the Interests of the Korean People"]

[Text] A few days ago the Soviet Union and South Korea established diplomatic relations. Even though this step was not unexpected, it came as a sensation in international life. On the whole, official circles, the press, and the public in different countries viewed this event positively. The most accurate, in my view, was the attitude expressed by the Japanese newspaper ASAHI, which noted that the first step has been taken toward destroying the cold war structures on the Korean peninsula.

At the same time I would not be telling the truth if I wrote that this approval were unanimous. Judging by Western news agency reports, representatives of the DPRK are saying that the normalization of Soviet-South Korean relations may seriously complicate the North-South dialogue as it legitimizes the division of a single country.

If those reports are true, one can understand Pyongyang's reaction in emotional terms. Let us not forget the millions of lives taken by the war in Korea. Let us not forget the decades spent in conditions when the DPRK was preparing to resist Seoul's well equipped and large forces and the 40,000-strong U.S. military contingent equipped with nuclear weapons. For decades the United States and South Korea dismissed out of hand the DPRK's well considered peace initiatives. All this, of course, was bound to create a certain psychological mood in Pyongyang.

All this is true. Nevertheless, the time has come to abandon the emotion and face up to the truth. And the truth is that two states exist on the Korean peninsula: the DPRK and the Republic of Korea. And the USSR, which was first to establish diplomatic relations with the DPRK, cannot ignore the existence of such an economically powerful state as South Korea. At the same time, however, no one denies the priority goal of Soviet foreign policy toward Korea. It was and remains the desire to promote the peaceful unification of the country by means of constructive inter-Korean dialogue.

However, let us consider: Did the USSR have until recently any real opportunities of putting into desire into actual effect? To be blunt, yes it did, but they were quite limited. Yes, we fully supported the DPRK's constructive initiatives aimed at the phased reduction of the Armed Forces in the North and South, the elimination of the foreign military presence in Korea, and the implementation of confidence-building measures. The idea of the transformation of the whole Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free peace zone acquires special relevance.

However, our country and our diplomatic service did not have an opportunity to convince the Seoul leaders of the reality of these initiatives. That needs direct contacts and normal diplomatic activity. Which is precisely what the establishment of diplomatic relations provides.

It should also be said that it is not only the Korean people who are interested in removing the military threat on the peninsula. Now, when the tendency toward lowering the level of military confrontation is evident throughout the world, Korea remains an island of confrontation. The high degree of concentration of forces and the most modern armaments (1.5 million military servicemen) is fraught with unpredictable consequences. But the activation of dialogue between the USSR and South Korea will finally provide a real opportunity to involve Seoul in the discussion of security problems in the Far East.

Therefore, the fears that the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea may hinder the unification of the Korean people have no real substance. And it is no coincidence that our country sought the legal enshrinement of the fact that the development of ties between the USSR and the Republic of Korea must not and will not harm the interests of third countries, including the DPRK. The interests of the Korean people are fully considered by the Soviet Union in its foreign policy.

### Korean Views Failure of UN Entry Bid

*SK0810232190 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[From "Asian News" program under "Focus on Asia"program]

[Text] The second round of talks between North and South Korea to discuss the issue of their entry into the United Nations again has ended in failure.

The talks were held in Panmunjom in closed-door sessions. After the talks, Choe U-chin, the DPRK delegate, said the two sides had failed to reach an agreement.

According to a UPI report, the ROK maintained the position that the separate entry of North and South Korea into the United Nations will contribute to their peaceful reunification.

Such a position by Seoul has the potential of rupturing the entire course of talks on this issue.

## Near East & South Asia

### Israelis Kill Palestinians in Jerusalem

#### Foreign Ministry Issues Statement

*LD0910145290 Moscow TASS in English 1442 GMT 9 Oct 90*

[Text] Moscow October 9 TASS—The Soviet Foreign Ministry today released a statement on the Israeli killings of Arabs in Jerusalem. Follows the full text.

"Reports about a new outburst of violence on Palestinian lands are causing deep anxiety in the Soviet Union.

"Tens of Palestinians were killed or wounded in Jerusalem during clashes with the Israeli police, who used weapons, on just one day, October 8. Hundreds were arrested, including prominent public figure F. Husayni.

"Firmly denouncing this action by Israeli authorities, the Soviet Union believes that the U.N. Security Council should display the same unanimity and consistency in the approach to the situation on the occupied territories as was effectively demonstrated by the Security Council with respect to Iraqi aggression against Kuwait.

"We support the idea of sending, as an initial step, a special U.N. mission to investigate the incident.

"The events in Jerusalem, which entailed numerous human sacrifices, further exacerbate the already volatile situation in the Middle East region and erect additional obstacles on the road towards a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

"They confirm the need for a wide-scale application of measures to normalise the situation in the Middle East and settle all conflicts there which destabilise both the region itself and international relations as a whole."

#### Israeli Actions Decried

*LD0910122690 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 9 Oct 90*

[By TASS political analyst Yuriy Tyssovskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 9 TASS—On Monday, Israeli soldiers opened fire on Palestinians in Jerusalem, killing at least 21 people. The Palestinians were protesting against the attempts of Zionist fundamentalists to begin the construction of a synagogue in the midst of mosques. More than 200 Palestinians were wounded. It is estimated that altogether 736 Palestinians, mainly teenagers and children, have been killed since the Palestinian uprising began in December 1987.

Israeli actions in Jerusalem have been censured in the lobbies of the U.N. Security Council and by statesmen in various countries. Meanwhile Israel accused the Palestine Liberation Organisation of whipping up tension at the bid of the organisation's "patron Saddam Hussayn" to distract attention from Kuwait's occupation by Iraq.

This explanation for the blood-letting in Jerusalem holds no water. The events at the Wailing Wall developed spontaneously and were the natural reaction to the arrogant conduct of Israeli extremists. Tel Aviv has no proof that the clashes were provoked deliberately.

It cannot be denied though that those who ordered soldiers to fire pointblank at the crowd are playing into the hands of the Iraqis. In the present conditions the Israeli leaders' irresponsible stand sets off an extremely dangerous chain reaction of violence in the Middle East, leading to the further aggravation of the situation, to the spread of extremist tendencies in the Arab world. French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas said justifiably that Israel was "playing into Saddam Hussayn's hands."

In any case, the shooting on a Palestinian demonstration by Israeli soldiers highlighted the need for comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem through the convocation of an international conference with the participation of all the sides involved in the conflict.

The Soviet Union and other countries see this as the way out. They reject all kinds of violence to which Israel and some of its adversaries, who have extermist attitudes, are not averse.

One can hardly disagree with President Francois Mitterrand of France, who emphasised that in view of the latest events in Jerusalem the convocation of an international conference in the Middle East became extremely topical as a method of settling the entire range of problems of the ill-fated region.

### Gulf Council Ministers Meet With Shevardnadze

*LD0510132190 Riyadh Television Service in Arabic 1100 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] The Gulf Cooperation Council foreign ministers met today in New York with His Excellency Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister. The meeting exchanged views on several international issues and stressed the importance of the international efforts aimed at implementation of Security Council resolutions on the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and its developments in

the Arab Gulf region. His Royal Highness Sa'ud al-Faysal, foreign minister, and His Royal Highness Bandar Bin Sultan, Saudi ambassador to Washington and member of the Kingdom's delegation to UN General Assembly's meeting. [sentence as heard]

On the Soviet side, Tarasenko, director of the planning departments at the Soviet Foreign Ministry; Sevanon, assistant to the Soviet foreign minister; USSR Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov, permanent delegate to the United Nations; Gennadiy Tarasov, Soviet Foreign Ministry Middle East affairs representative; and Shirikin, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, attended the meeting.

## Mideast Envoy Primakov Continues Visit to Iraq

### Meets With Saddam

*LD0610134590 Moscow TASS in English 1335 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] Baghdad October 6 TASS—Personal representative of the Soviet president Yevgeniy Primakov and his party departed from Iraq for Moscow today.

During the visit, he conveyed a personal message from Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to Iraqi President Saddam Husayn in connection with the dangerous development of the Gulf situation.

During a lengthy meeting, the Soviet side stressed that the USSR is for a political settlement of the crisis, having in mind the return to a situation which existed before August 2.

On instructions from the Soviet president, Primakov raised the question about the departure of Soviet specialists from Iraq. Husayn assured him that a group of Soviet citizens may leave for the USSR in the near future.

Primakov and Deputy Prime Minister Igor Belousov visited a township of builders which is being constructed with Soviet assistance near the Euphrates River and talked to Soviet specialists.

The two statesmen explained the steps by the Soviet Government to ensure normal living conditions for Soviet people in the aggravated situation.

In Baghdad, Primakov and Belousov met representatives of the Soviet community in Iraq and described the policy of the Soviet leadership, the results of the talks with the Iraqi leadership on the departure of Soviet people from Iraq.

### 'Optimistic' After Talks

*LD0610164290 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] The Soviet president's personal envoy, Yevgeniy Primakov, has said he is optimistic about about the outlook for a political settlement in the Persian Gulf. He was speaking after his meeting with the Iraqi President Saddam Husayn before leaving Baghdad.

Primakov said he was satisfied with his talks with the Iraqi leaders. At yesterday's meeting with Saddam Husayn the Soviet envoy said that the USSR wants a political settlement of the crisis, implying the return to the state of affairs before Iraq's invasion of Kuwait on 2 August. Primakov delivered a message from President Gorbachev to the Iraqi leader.

The evacuation of Soviet specialists from Iraq was brought up. President Husayn said a large group of Soviet people would be able to leave Iraq shortly. Yevgeniy Primakov met with some Soviet specialists working in Iraq to brief them on the steps taken by the Soviet Government to normalize the Soviet people's life in Iraq and on the results of the talks concerning their return home.

### Agreement on Specialists Reached

*LD0610213290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2100 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Interview with Yevgeniy Primakov, Gorbachev's Mideast representative, upon return from a visit to Iraq, by correspondent E. Dzhafarov, from the "Television News Service" program]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Up to now the question of the fate of more than 5,000 Soviet specialists working in Iraq has not been completely clear. Primakov, Gorbachev's representative, arrived from Baghdad today. [passage omitted]

[Dzhafarov] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, you have just arrived from Iraq where you had a conversation with Saddam Husayn, president of Iraq, on the fate of the Soviet hostages still remaining in Iraq. What were the results of this?

[Primakov] You have misphrased the question. You must not speak of hostages, because none of our people are hostages. The attitude to our people is far from being what you describe in your question.

This was a special mission. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the president of the Soviet Union, sent us there, first to come to an agreement so that anyone who wants to leave for home could leave, and this has been done, and second to continue the discussion that has already been going on to achieve a political settlement.

[Announcer] Let me remind you that Baghdad has said before that the Soviet specialists are not hostages. But up to now at least 500 Soviet citizens who wish to leave Iraq cannot do so. We understand Primakov's statement as meaning that they will be given exit visas immediately.

### Belousov Interviewed on Results

*LD0810201790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[Interview with Igor Sergeyevich Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by Vladimir Ivanovich Lobachenko on 8 October; place not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—live or recorded]

[Text] [Belousov] I was in both Jordan and Iraq with Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, personal envoy of our president, Mikhail Sergeyvich Gorbachev. The main aim of our trip was to promote the search for a political settlement of the serious conflict in the Persian Gulf region. Our very long and detailed conversations with King Husayn of Jordan, with 'Arafat, president of the state of Palestine, and with Iraqi president Saddam Husayn were devoted to this theme. Since our trip, I have personally felt more hope about a political solution to the crisis.

[Lobachenko] Igor Sergeyevich, information agencies are reporting that in the course of your talks in Baghdad you concluded an agreement with the Iraqi authorities on a schedule for the exit of our specialists from Iraq. I have such a report here.

[Belousov] Yes, one of the most important issues we discussed at all levels was the issue of our specialists. There are around 5,000 of them there today. They are working at various installations based on cooperation agreements that were concluded previously. The situation at all the installations is highly tense, as it is for everyone who is connected with the conflict in the Persian Gulf region. Naturally, many of those who are working in Iraq are persistently asking to be returned to the Soviet Union before the time limit for their work contracts expires. We did agree that in the course of one month we will return to the Soviet Union 1,500 of our specialists. As you, Vladimir Ivanovich, have said, we did agree in principle on a schedule for the return of these people. On our return to Moscow, we carried out the necessary measures and prepared airplanes—Tu-154's and Il-86 airplanes —which will work to resolve that task. Incidentally, an airplane from Baghdad arrived today with 156 [as heard] Soviet specialists on board.

[Lobachenko] Are there positive results from your visit?

[Belousov] Yes, I think that the results in this respect, have to be considered positive.

[Lobachenko] You met our specialists in Iraq. What is their mood? What, on the whole, are their living conditions?

[Belousov] Well, I have said already that tension affects everybody. That tension does not bypass our specialists who are working in Iraq. It is mainly because of this that 1,800 people are demanding to return home before their contracts expire. But I have to say to you that, on the whole, the mood in our collectives is normal. I would call it a working mood. Incidentally, they asked that their greetings and kindest wishes be passed to all their nearest and dearest in the Soviet Union. They asked that greetings be passed to their friends and comrades.

### Palestinian Envoy Interviewed on Gulf Crisis

*PM0310140690 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 38, 18-24 Sep 90 p 6,7*

[Interview with Nabil 'Amr, ambassador of the state of Palestine in USSR, by Dmitriy Zgerskiy—place and date not given]

[Text] [Zgerskiy] Your Excellency, how do you assess the present situation in the Persian Gulf?

['Amr] In my opinion, the main factor in the present situation is the concentration of American troops in Saudi Arabia and some neighbouring emirates, as well as of naval forces of Western states. Foreign interference has brought about divisions in the Arab world at an official level. Some countries favour the presence of foreign troops and cooperate with them, while others consider such a situation dangerous to the Arab states, to their sovereignty and natural wealth.

As for an unofficial level, the people of the Arab East, the vast majority of them are against the military presence of the United States and other Western countries in the region. This is, perhaps, the only thing which united Arabs with regard to the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

[Zgerskiy] You condemn the U.S. invasion of the Gulf area. But there would have been no foreign interference if Iraq had not seized Kuwait. Why did you not condemn the capture of Kuwait by Iraq?

['Amr] I shall reply to this question in this way. First of all, regarding the United States and its allies. In our opinion, the U.S. invasion of the Persian Gulf zone is fraught with the danger of a large-scale military conflict. We had warned against this invasion for, in our opinion, the United States had not right to interfere in our regional affairs by force of arms. I would like to stress that for many years Washington ignored the UN decisions concernig the Middle East, the Palestinian problem in particular. The United States should take a just and balanced stand. For instance, it does not care that the UN Resolution 242 on the Middle East and Israeli occupation has not been fulfilled till now, though it was passed 23 years ago. So we Palestinians have reasons to disapprove of the United States, and not only on the question of its present invasion.

Secondly, taking a purely Arab aspect, it can be said that before the Iraqi attack on Kuwait, Palestine made serious mediatory efforts to settle relations between Iraq, Kuwait and other Gulf states by peaceful means, in a brotherly way. The military occupation of Kuwait by Iraq also came as a surprise to us, for we have always been against the seizure of territories by force. Nevertheless, we continued our mediatory efforts and insist that

this problem should be solved by Arabs themselves. Foreign interference has created serious obstacles in the way of a just solution of the problem between Iraq and Kuwait.

[Zgerskiy] About 400,000 Palestinians worked in Kuwait. They rendered financial assistance to the PLO in addition to the aid granted by Kuwait. Do you think that the Iraqi government can give the Palestinians the same assistance after its seizure of Kuwait?

['Amr] We do not consider the events in the Persian Gulf from this point of view. We are rather concerned about the bad economic condition of Palestinians in the occupied territories. We are not going to ask for anyone's help to compensate for our economic losses, for we are not the only ones who suffered from the present situation. We are concerned not about the financial aspect, but about the present state of the Palestinian problem.

What has happened in the Gulf region is, in my opinion, a result of disregard on the part of the world community for a comprehensive Middle East settlement. We are alarmed over the fact that the agreement between great powers on the need of settling all regional conflicts by peaceful means has not been applied to our region. This can lead to unpredictable developments.

[Zgerskiy] Do you not think that the pan-Arab cause would gain much if Iraq tried to find a common language with Syria, instead of dealing a blow to Kuwait?

['Amr] We are unable to understand the motives of Syria, which openly cooperates with the United States in the Gulf crisis. We have always favoured mutual understanding between Arabs, in particular, between Iraq and Syria too. Unfortunately, these two states have not reconciled with each other since then.

[Zgerskiy] Today we see that the PLO sides with one group of Arab countries, distancing itself from the other. This evidently, aggravates the split. Can the Palestinians count in these conditions on the all-Arab support of their just cause?

['Amr] I do not agree that we have joined one group of Arab countries against the other. In the Arab League, we expressed restraint on the question of some approaches to the present situation, and many member states of the League shared our position. For instance, we voiced doubts regarding haste in the adoption of decisions. The Gulf crisis called for a thoughtful approach. It was necessary to hold thorough inter-Arab consultations. Instead of this, the League adopted hasty decisions. We were not persuaded by statements that Iraq intends to seize Saudi Arabia, and many agreed with our view. We were against a hasty and massive dispatch of troops to the region. In our opinion, it was necessary to use Islamic, inter-Arab forces or a UN force.

We are now criticized for maintaining normal relations with Iraq. I want to say that we shall be unable to play the role of a mediator without normal relations with all parties involved in the conflict. When the United States sent its troops, and an economic blockade against Iraq was introduced, when the question was raised of dealing a blow to Iraq and punishing those who violated the blockade, the possibility of settling the conflict by Arabs was reduced to zero, while the situation became extremely complicated. I must say forthright that we Palestinians cannot support the United States at a time when it threatens an Arab state.

[Zgerskiy] How do you assess the coverage of the Gulf situation in the Soviet press, in the NEW TIMES in particular?

['Amr] Before turning diplomat, I worked in the press. I was very glad to see glasnost was promoted in the Soviet Union. I thought that freedom of speech in the USSR would open up new opportunities for bringing the truth about the problems of Palestinians to the broad sections of the Soviet public. But I must say frankly that the coverage of events in the Persian Gulf is merely a repetition of what is written in the United States and other Western countries, a repetition without a critical approach to their statements.

For instance, NEW TIMES simply reproduced an American article about Yasir 'Arafat. The Soviet press also carried articles which, to put it mildly, did not contribute to the promotion of friendly relations with Arab countries. Many reckless and thoughtless judgements were published, too. For instance, why to call Saddam Hussayn a "Baghdad thief"? Instead of copying their Western colleagues, Soviet journalists should have visited the region and then expressed their judgements.

I have noticed that the Soviet press has recently carried many articles containing unfavourable statements about Palestinians. However, few journalists try to understand the motives of their actions. In this way the press carries one-sided and biased information about us. This does not mean that we are against criticism. We simply want this criticism to be constructive and friendly, not hostile.

## Reports, Comments Continue on Specialists in Iraq

### Over 100 Return to Moscow

*LD0810162890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Today, 126 Soviet specialists who were in Iraq returned to Moscow. The Aeroflot plane left Baghdad yesterday evening a few hours after presidential representative Yevgeniy Primakov left Iraq.

Approximately a further 5,000 Soviet citizens, mainly oil industry specialists, are in Iraq. [passage omitted]

### 'Fate' of Remaining Experts Eyed

*PM0810174090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 1*

[Article by A. Ostalskiy and postscript citing USSR Defense Ministry remarks to correspondent V. Litovkin: "Fate of Soviet Citizens in Iraq: Contradictory News"]

[Text] Early Monday morning an Aeroflot plane landed at Sheremetyevo-2 International Airport, bringing 128 Soviet citizens from Baghdad. They were lucky—they had left a country where it is becoming unsafe, to put it mildly, to remain. But that number is only a drop in the bucket: After all, more than 5,000 of our fellow citizens are still at various economic facilities in Iraq, some of which could become targets in the event of the start of full-scale hostilities. According to available information, many of the Soviet specialists would like to return home immediately, but do not yet have the opportunity.

What is our country doing to safeguard our citizens?

As you know, a Soviet delegation headed by Ye.M. Primakov, member of the USSR Presidential Council, has just been to Baghdad, and ensuring the successful departure of our compatriots from Iraq was virtually the main task of this mission. At the same time, apparently, certain diplomatic efforts were also made with a view to promoting the peaceful resolution of the Persian Gulf crisis in general.

The world media take different views of the results of this visit. Britain's THE SUNDAY TIMES, noting that the Soviet representative expressed satisfaction with the results of the talks, claims that the USSR proposed that Iraq withdraw its troops from Kuwait, after which it would supposedly be possible to begin preparations for international conferences on settling conflicts throughout the region.

In this connection Western newspapers are asking: Does the moderate optimism heard in Ye.M. Primakov's statements after his meetings with Iraqi President S. Husayn and Foreign Minister T. 'Aziz mean that this proposal met with a positive response from Iraq? But in that case how is this analysis compatible with the renewed statements by Iraqi officials that there can be no question of withdrawing Baghdad's troops from Kuwait?

Certain authoritative mass media take the view that the Soviet delegation's mission yielded no tangible results. French television, for instance, claims that Yevgeniy Primakov was unable to reach an agreement with the Iraqi authorities on the question of the fate of Soviet specialists in Iraq. At the same time, AFP reports that in the course of Saturday's meeting in Baghdad between Igor Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Isam al-Jalabi, Iraqi oil minister, a concrete timetable was discussed for the departure for the USSR of the Soviet specialists, most of whom work in the oil production field. This information apparently confirms official reports that, as the Iraqi president put it, there are no "political obstacles" to the Soviet citizens' leaving Iraq. But does that mean that there are other obstacles—economic and legal?

Unfortunately, by the time today's issue went to press, IZVESTIYA had been unable to obtain from competent Soviet sources, the USSR Foreign Ministry or the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, confirmation or refutation of this report, which is being actively discussed in the foreign press. Our diplomats' caution is to some extent understandable: These are rather delicate matters. All the same, I think our public has the right to know how safe the Soviet people in Iraq are and whether confidentiality is being used as a cover for the latest blunder by our departments, which failed to evacuate our specialists from Iraq in time. We hope that this time it is not a question of the "good old tradition" of putting people's lives and safety in tenth place after economic or political interests. But it would be nice to have concrete proof of this; after all, readers will not take our word for it.

In this context we would like to hear some answers to questions that are now being discussed openly in the West, but remain a mystery to our readers, for instance:

How true is THE NEW YORK TIMES report that our compatriots will only be able to leave for home when their contracts expire?

Is it true that only 500 people out of more than 5,000 will be able to leave Iraq in the foreseeable future, while the rest will be forced to stay, like it or not?

Is it a fact that the Iraqi side has officially asked the USSR to keep the greater part of our specialists in Iraq, at least until the beginning of next year?

We hope to be able to answer all these questions exhaustively in our next issue. [Ostalskiy ends]

And how do things stand with our military specialists who are still in Iraq? No one has ever created any obstacles to their leaving for home, our correspondent V. Litovkin was told at the USSR Defense Ministry. There is only on basis for leaving for home—the expiration of the signed contracts. And whereas on 1 August this year there were 216 of our military specialists in Iraq, today only 93 remain there. They will all return home when their contracts expire.

And another thing: Not one man has left the USSR for Iraq to replace these specialists.

## Commentaries Report on, Assess Gulf Crisis

### Soviet Involvement Unlikely

*LD0610151890*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1030 GMT on 6 October carries a 30-minute

program entitled "Forecast" ["Prognoz"], the first program in a new series. The program is presented by Igor Pototskiy.

Several items are presented on the subject of predicting the future, focussing largely on John Naisbitt's "Megatrends" forecast for the 1990s and Nikolay Kondratyev's theory of economic cyclicity.

Interviews are shown with U.S. consultant L. Mattera on future political trends; journalist A. Bovin on world political developments; Soviet economist S. Shatalov on the importance of stabilizing the Ruble; and astrologer I. Saponnikov on predetermination and free will.

In a six-minute interview, Pototskiy asks Bovin to comment on the prospects following German reunification: "I can talk about the next 50 years—I cannot see any further. For the next 50 years there is an absolute prospect of stability in Europe. The Germans have no need of war. You see, in this situation they have no need of war.... Everything they want they can achieve in conditions of peace. Leaving aside, that is, the possibility of a madman. Taking a normal view of natural trends."

German unification was a natural desire, Bovin continues, and before it happened "one had the impression that a bomb was ticking away somewhere and nobody knew what would happen to it." This bomb has now been defused and any concern was "unfounded."

Moving on to the prospect of war in the Gulf, Bovin said: "Theoretically, a peaceful solution is possible. For that, Saddam Husayn has to return to a status quo. It is all very simple.... All the Arab options that have been proposed, the various options, they all leave Saddam some piece of his aggression. This will not do. Either the status quo is restored, complete peace, or if it is not, there will be war. In my view there is a 60-70

chance of war at the moment." The probability of a rapid defeat of Iraq in the event of war is "obvious," continued Bovin, but "it would be serious, I think, because in such a situation he might blow up the oilfields, everything would be set on fire and have to be rebuilt."

"Bovin continues: "There will be a reaction from the Arab world, of course, but they themselves have brought that... the fundamentals will shout for a bit then be silent. They themselves brought this about. We have told them to solve the problem themselves, but they cannot solve it themselves....

The possibility of Soviet participation in any Gulf war, according to Bovin, is "zero—both because our country is in crisis and because of the Afghan syndrome, which is by no means overcome, and for all the other reasons. Zero, I would say. The Supreme Soviet would not agree to it in such a situation Gorbachev would not venture to do this even by a presidential decree."

## UN Role Viewed

*LD0710133790 Moscow TASS in English 1323 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[By TASS political analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow October 7 TASS—The Iraqi aggression against Kuwait has aggravated the situation in the Middle East. On the other hand, the Gulf crisis spotlighted burning problems in the region, including the Palestinian question underlying the Arab-Israeli conflict.

It is not expedient to link a solution of the Gulf crisis with a settlement of other issues of international politics, including the Palestinian problem.

The situation now demands the immediate fulfilment of U.N. Security Council resolutions adopted after the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait.

They are prompted by the desire to prevent a war in the Gulf. The Baghdad leaders should display political wisdom and spurn down extremism.

If they do so, it will be possible to resolve the conflict peacefully, since the the U.N. Security Council drafted in detail the legal basis for such a solution.

As soon as Iraq withdraws its troops from Kuwait and the regime overthrown by the invadors is restored in that country, a real opportunity will emerge to look for ways of settling other conflicts in the region.

The governments of many countries are now ready for this, which is corroborated by the recent statements of President George Bush and British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd.

The two statesmen said that as soon as the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait ends, it is necessary to begin settling the Palestinian problem without delay.

It is indicative that growing numbers of countries connect its solution with an international Middle East conference to be called by the United Nations. This is not accidental.

In the past, the USSR, Western Europe and the Arab world thought that the conference should be held under the U.N. auspices, believing that only this organisation can find mutually acceptable political compromises.

Other countries assumed that the solution of the Palestinian problem can be achieved only through a direct dialogue between Tel Aviv and the Palestinians, bypassing the United Nations.

However, after the international coalition against the Iraqi aggression was formed thanks to the close cooperation between U.N. Security Council members, these countries, including the United States, are changing their opinion about the U.N. role.

The United Nations is now gaining a chance to function as it should under its charter thanks to Soviet-American partnership which was developing in the recent past.

That is why Hurd suggested that the experience of cooperation between the Security Council permanent members should be used as a "model of cooperation" to settle the Palestinian problem.

It is indicative that the U.N. Security Council has already begun the debate on the Israeli-occupied Arab territories.

This shows the U.N. desire to give attention not only the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait but also to a search for settling the Palestinian problem.

This problem can be eventually resolved provided there is goodwill and the balance of the interests of all parties to the conflict.

### 'Tragic Climax' Expected

*LD0810132790 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[Text] Yuriy Solton takes a look at the Persian Gulf situation which many have been describing as an uneasy calm.

Obviously, he says, things are nearing a tragic climax, although President Bush and Prime Minister Thatcher are still hoping that there is a way to avoid war. President Gorbachev's spokesman, Yevgeniy Primakov, too, has expressed optimism about the prospects of settling the Gulf crisis politically, following his visit to Baghdad for talks with President Saddam Husayn. But there have been few, if any at all, signs of progress towards unblocking the conlfict peacefully. Far from that, Bagdhad's stand has been growing tougher and all calls upon Iraqi leaders to withdraw troops from Kuwait in response to the United Nations demand have been vigorously rejected.

Iraq has been threatening, in the event of opened armed clashes, to use all available weapons, including chemical and bacteriological, and possibly the atom bomb which United States and Israeli intelligence say Iraq has at is disposal. Significantly, Iraqi policy has been supported by a number of Arab countries which have suspiciously watched the 200,000 United States Army, the core of the international force in the Gulf, taking a firm foothold in Saudi Arabia and which have thought it unlikely that the Americans will leave the Gulf area once the crisis has been settled.

The U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT magazine has stated for its part that the Washington Administration is profoundly concerned by the promptness with which Iraq has been devouring Kuwait and is fearing that the anti-Iraq front may begin to disintegrate if no early action is taken. The magazine indicates that the United States may open hostilities within the next four to eight weeks. Defense Secretary Dick Cheney has indirectly confirmed that report by saying his country will resolutely resist the Iraqi attack which may be expected to come shortly. The Spanish foreign minister, Francisco Fernandez-Ordonez, has expressed concern over the Gulf developments. After the European Community's conference which discussed the Gulf situation he suggested that the region was closer to war than to a peaceful settlement. Some Arab nations have been speaking of a military option as a reliable way to settle the crisis. But, clearly enough, hostilities would only cause the Gulf crisis to spread beyond the regional framework. Of course, it would be impermissible to let Iraq annex Kuwait and get away with it, thus creating a precedent for future aggressions. But solutions have to be sought in the nonmilitary area and provide for reasonable and mutually acceptable compromises.

### Iranian Conservatives' Support of Iraq Eyed

*NC0810112890 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 3 Oct 90*

[Station commentary]

[Text] In Iran the government's policy of support for the international sanctions against Iraq comes at the same time as various political figures and the mass media are making threats about disregarding the UN's wishes. What is the reason for this? Our analyst addresses this question:

These threats are coming from representatives of Iran's conservative circles who oppose reforms in the country's domestic and foreign policies. These same circles, who insisted on the continuation of the war with Iraq until final victory, are now either willingly or unwillingly supporting the Baghdad regime.

Of course the issue is not one of affection or lack of affection for the Iraqi regime. The issue is the conservatives' political objectives and their ideological directives. These people support the policy of isolationism, and their view that the world is hostile and Iran a fortress under siege fully conforms with this policy.

The supporters of this policy need extraordinary conditions both at home and abroad to prove that they are above considerations of material comfort. Iraq's attack on Khuzestan created such extraordinary conditions. This attack was thwarted after 18 months, but Iran's conservatives were in no hurry to end the war even though they had many opportunities to do so.

Now, when Iraq has accepted all Iran's conditions for a solution, the conservative forces are trying to play on the Iranian people's natural fears about the expansion of the U.S. presence in the Arabian peninsula. The recent large and loud demonstrations in Iran which were held under the slogan of "Death to America" were organized with the participation of these forces.

It is clear that the Iranians have strong reasons for disagreeing with the United States. However, I believe

that the conservatives are knowingly ignoring the relationship between the presence of the U.S. soldiers in Saudi Arabia and the Iraqi aggression. They downplay Baghdad's impudent disregard for the international community's will, and it is because of this that their inclination to fan the flames of anti-American sentiments is less the result of true threats to Iran than of a wish to exacerbate the political situation.

Opposing the policy of isolationism in Iran is the policy of arranging the country's extensive international relations and liberalizing the regime. Iran's participation in international sanctions against Baghdad is a natural part of this latter policy and gives it the opportunity to be seen by public opinion in various countries as upholding legality, justice, and civilized behavior.

I think that this policy meets the needs of Iranians' moral sentiments. Opening of the Tehran international trade fair, Hojjat ol-Eslam Hashemi-Rafsanjani pointed out that Baghdad's aggression has threatened international security and pushed the world to the brink of confrontation.

The policy of international cooperation in the fight to eliminate the consequences of Iraq's aggression against Kuwait benefits Iran not only morally and politically, but also economicall. This, I believe, is what will guarantee that the supporters of Iran's reconstruction will triumph over the mentors of isolationism.

### Omani Deputy Premier Continues Visit

*LD0510155290 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kumachev]

[Text] Moscow October 5 TASS—Omani Deputy Prime Minister Qays 'Abd-al-Mun'm al-Zawawi has described the results of his visit to the Soviet Union, which ended today, as an event of historic significance.

Al-Zawawi told TASS he valued the fact that President Mikhail Gorbachev had found time to receive the delegation, which conveyed greetings of the Omani sultan to the president.

The conversation between President Gorbachev and the Omani deputy-premier brought to light an identity of views on a number of issues concerning international cooperation, including in the economic field. The importance of top-level bilateral contacts was stressed.

Broad opportunities now exist for mutually beneficial and fruitful cooperation between Oman and the Soviet Union, Al-Zawawi said. But this cooperation should have a solid basis.

For this purpose, links and contacts should be promoted and increased in all spheres. The peoples of the two countries should come to know each other better in order to identify specific fields of cooperation.

The head of the Omani delegation (?met) with the leadership of the Soviet Ministry of External Economic Affairs, the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity, and the State Foreign Economic Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Al-Zawawi said the proposals concerning ways to expand [words indistinct] brought to the attention of the Omani business community with the aim of involving [passage indistinct]

### Lukyanov's Talks With Omani Delegation Continue

*PM0910095190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Meeting With Omani Delegation"]

[Text] A.I. Lukyanov, USSR Supreme Soviet chairman, met an Omani legislative delegation headed by 'A. al-Qatabi, president of the Consultative Assembly, 4 October in Moscow.

At the request of his Omani guests A.I. Lukyanov described the current phase in the country's development, stressing that the transformations developing within it are dictated by a desire to give society a second wind, renew all aspects of its economic, political, and spiritual life, reinforce law and order and legality, and ensure the consistent implementation of the Soviet Union's peace-loving and constructive foreign policy course.

An examination of key issues of Soviet-Omani relations and international policy revealed the coincidence or proximity of many of the sides' positions. The sides noted the onward development of these relations and stressed the need to deepen them, notably in the sphere of interparliamentary contacts.

During their discussion of questions related to the situation in the Persian Gulf area, the sides were united in condemning the Iraqi aggression and in demanding compliance with the relevant UN Security Council resolutions. 'A. al-Qatabi said that Oman, like most Arab states, intends to strive for the unconditional withdrawal of the Iraqi troops from Kuwait and the restoration of that state's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Both sides stressed the importance of consolidating the efforts of the world community as a whole and the Arab world in particular in the quest for political solutions to the crisis on the basis of universally recognized norms of international law.

USSR People's Deputy M.Yu. Yusupov and N.M. 'Ali al-Shaykh, Omani ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

### Greetings Exchanged With Oman on Anniversary

*PM0510154190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] In connection with the fifth anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the Sultanate of Oman, the foreign ministries of both countries have exchanged greetings telegrams.

E.A. Shevardnadze's message notes that the development of Soviet-Omani relations has coincided fortuitously with the affirmation of the principles of the new political thinking and the primacy of values common to all mankind. It is no accident that one of the main directions of cooperation between our countries is the struggle against those who are lapsing into the old way of thinking and provoking acute crises, and collaboration in establishing peace, justice, and stability in the Near East and the Persian Gulf zone. The belief that mutual understanding between the USSR and Oman will grow stronger and more extensive was also expressed.

The telegram of Y. 'Alawi, Omani minister of state for foreign affairs, stresses that the Sultanate notes with satisfaction everything that has been achieved in Soviet-Omani relations. The message expresses a desire for their further development and strengthening in the interests of both countries for the good of international peace and cooperation.

## East Europe

### Trade Official Discusses Oil Deliveries to CSFR

*LD0610174190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1937 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondent Igor Shamshin]

[Text] Prague 5 Oct (TASS)—"In the first half of the current year Soviet oil deliveries to the CSFR were sufficient. They were carried out in accordance with the protocol on trade turnover for 1990, signed by the USSR and Czechoslovakia, which envisages the delivery of 16.6 million tonnes of oil," Ivan Panteleyev, USSR trade representative in the CSFR, stressed in conversation with a TASS correspondent. He said that the trend toward the reduction in oil exports emerged last July because of the worsening economic situation in the USSR and, in the first place, in oil-producing regions.

"We have delivered up to the present day 10 million tonnes of oil to the CSFR, although there has been a delay in expected deliveries. However, in September Czechoslovakia received 300,000 tonnes of this fuel in addition to that agreed upon by the protocol. The Soviet side has made a proposal to deliver approximately the same amount of oil in October. Moreover, within the framework of developing economic links between the CSFR and individual Soviet republics, at the moment talks are going on concerning the delivery by the end of the year of 500,000 tonnes of oil on a barter basis. I hope that next week the contract will be signed. Taking all this into account, oil deliveries from the Soviet Union in October may be more than a million tonnes," Ivan Panteleyev said.

Describing the general situation of Soviet oil exports, Panteleyev said the reduction in oil deliveries affected not only Czechoslovakia, but also other central and East European countries. "There can be no question of oil discrimination against Czechoslovakia," the head of the Soviet foreign trade mission stated. Panteleyev expressed his emphatic disagreement with the view, voiced in some cases, that the reduction in oil deliveries from the USSR has political connotations.

Touching on the question of the second increase this year in the retail price of gasoline in the CSFR, the trade representative said this is not directly connected to Soviet oil deliveries. This problem must be examined in the context of Czechoslovak Government policies revoking subsidies to enterprise previously receiving them. The increase in the cost of gasoline, in the trade representative's opinion, corresponds to the move toward market mechanisms. He noted that the aim of the reforms in Czechoslovakia—just as in the Soviet Union—is an increase in the economic effectiveness of business activities. "This is connected to the retail price policy and with the policy on prices on the internal market as a whole, which is the business of the Czechoslovak side," Panteleyev said.

### CSFR's Calfa Discusses Oil Supply

*LD0510134390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Report on interview with Marian Calfa, chairman of the CSFR Government; from the "Vremya" newscast; Calfa's comments are in Czech with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Announcer] Marian Calfa, chairman of the CSFR government, stressed in a conversation with Boris Pankin, the USSR's ambassador to the CSFR, that oil from the Soviet Union has ceased to be delivered and this applies even to the minimal amounts essential to maintain the operation cycle of refineries.

[Calfa] We shall ask the Soviet ambassador to appeal to the country's leadership. We wish to come to an agreement and to come to the USSR together with the president as soon as possible. We are talking here about oil deliveries; all our reforms, everything we started is jeopardized.

[Correspondent] The interview by Marian Calfa, chairman of the Czechoslovak Government, which was broadcast on television, voiced alarm he did not wish to conceal.

All today's papers published a report on the Czechoslovak leadership's intention. This reminds us yet again of how the economies of our countries are linked. The long years of common path made them resemble each other in many things. However, Czechoslovakia was first to turn off onto a path that leads to the market and, essentially, its successes and mistakes represent our capital and it is already time to let it work for us.

The leading Czechoslovak and Moscow economists met in the Lnare Castle which belongs to the Czechoslovak Government. They are discussing analogies in the social and economic developments of both countries.

**PRAVDA Warns of East Europe 'Authoritarianism'**

*PM0510210790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 90 First Edition p 4*

[Unattributed article under the rubric: "International Information": "Exclusions Are Inadvisable Where Democracy Is Concerned"]

[Text] The major political discussion held at the 28th CPSU Congress did not sidestep the acute problems of East Europe. For all the diversity of opinion about what is happening in our neighbors' countries—ranging from euphoria at the new phenomena to nostalgia for the past—the main thing was not in question: Namely, the unshakability of the principle of freedom of choice, which has become the imperative of progress and a condition of the preservation of modern civilization.

Today's reality is the failure of the national versions of the Stalinist authoritarian, bureaucratic system in the region. Where the East European countries go next is the business of their peoples. It is important for us to maintain good-neighborliness on a voluntary, mutually beneficial basis and the joint drive toward a common home in Europe.

At the same time anxiety at the upsurges of belligerent anticommunism in a number of East European countries was bound to be voiced at the congress. This involved, after all, real threats to the future of hundreds of thousands of people who are sincerely devoted to the ideas of socialism and who have nothing in common with those who discredited those ideas and led the countries into deep crisis. The feelings and attitudes of Soviet Communists were reflected in the resolution "In Defense of Democratic Rights and Opposition to the Persecution of Communists" and speeches by participants in the party forum.

However, the development of events shows that the problem of discrimination against forces of the left in East Europe has not, unfortunately, lost its edge.

The sacking and burning of the Bulgarian Socialist Party Central Building in Sofia and the calls for physical punishment to be meted out to its activists surely indicate this.

Then there was the scandalous draft instruction dismissing from Czechoslovak state establishments not just former party apparatus workers but also graduates of certain Soviet educational institutions. And although the official authorities dissociated themselves from this document, the actual idea of "cleansing" state and economic organs of the Communist nomenklatura as part of the "second stage of the revolution" has not, it seems, been repudiated. And already calls have again been made in parliament to remove all Communists—past and present—from the leading sphere and to ban their participation in political life for a decade to come.

Similar ideas are also circulating in certain Hungarian political circles. Democratic Forum's proposal to adopt the "Juszticia" ("Justice") plan, whereby everyone "to blame for the sociopolitical and economic crisis in the period since 1956" could have proceedings—up to and including criminal proceedings—instituted against them, is symptomatic.

In Poland thousands of former figures and activists of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] and journalists of the closed-down Prasa-Ksiega-Ruch party publishing cooperative have lost their jobs. Past membership of the party is increasingly becoming a pretext for depriving people of their right to work not just in organs of state administration and foreign and internal affairs but also public education. Virtually all the round-table accords enabling former PZPR members to participate in political life have been unilaterally broken.

The list of examples could be continued. The obvious conclusion to be drawn from them is that the inability of the present ruling forces to cope with the difficulties of the transition period and deliver on the grand promises made to the voters is urging them to seek out more and more new culprits. But can one shift responsibility for the past onto the masses of rank-and-file party members who, under totalitarian rule, were just as deprived of the opportunity to really influence policy as their fellow-citizens? Is it playing clean and fair to deliberately obliterate the considerable contribution made to democratic transformations by the reformist tendencies of communist parties in a number of East European countries and the constructive role they played in others in the nonviolent resolution of internal political crises on the basis of respect for the people's will?

We foresee the reproach that double standards are being used: Why has the CPSU, which kept silent when the former leaders of East Europe persecuted dissidents, broke up demonstrations, and refused even to hear the word "pluralism, suddenly starting talking about democracy? Well, first, it did not keep silent—only the ways of conveying our position to the leadership of the former ruling parties were different, corresponding to the nature of the relations then prevailing with them. And second, the commitment to democratic values as the main element of their political platform proclaimed by the current East European leaders gives us the moral right to talk this way.

When you hear about the increasing number of new cases of discrimination, you cannot help wondering whether democracy itself will withstand the pressure of destructive calls to settle historical accounts and the mood of political revenge. Are yesterday's champions of rights not degenerating into the people whom they fought against when in opposition? After all, democracy tolerates no exclusions. The history of witch-hunts,

which have been conducted in various countries in the 20th century, in one place from the right, in another from the left, teaches us that the practice of blacklists has its own, invariably repeating snowball logic which knows no limits.

Our negative attitude to the oppression of Communists is far from dictated by narrow party solidarity. More serious matters are at stake. The revolutions in East Europe proceeded under the banner of overthrowing authoritarianism, and that was bound to arouse the sympathy of Soviet people, who got to know all its charms through their own bitter experience.

Is it possible that another authoritarianism, only with the reverse label, is coming to replace the one that has perished? That would be a tragic outcome for the changes that have given the region a chance for genuinely democratic renewal.

## West Europe

### Soviet Soldiers Desert, Sell Weapons in Germany

*LD0610013490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2252 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Some curious news from Germany: The headquarters of the Soviet Group of Forces in the Potsdam District has registered more than 200 soldiers who have deserted. Most of them are requesting political asylum in the FRG.

German journalists are reporting mass speculation in any sort of Soviet weapons. In the past week is is not just Kalashnikov assault rifles and ammunition, grenades, and anti-tank mines that have been bought from Soviet officers on the territory of the former GDR, but artillery shells and even surface-to-air rockets.

### Spokesman on Gorbachev Visits to Germany, France

*LD0910133590 Berlin ADN International Service in German 1243 GMT 9 Oct 90*

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—Vitaliy Ignatenko, spokesman for the Soviet president, confirmed in Moscow on Tuesday that Mikhail Gorbachev will visit Germany in November. In reply to a question from ADN, he said that the trip was planned. The spokesman also said that Gorbachev would be visiting France at the end of October.

### Lukyanov Receives Icelandic Parliament Delegation

*LD0510181490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today in the Kremlin, Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, met with an Icelandic parliamentary delegation which is in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. During the conversation, particular attention was focused on European affairs and the profound changes that are currently taking place on the continent. It was stressed that the forthcoming Paris conference of the heads of states and governments of European countries, the United States, and Canada will be an important step in the construction of a new system of European security. The parliaments of these countries and their interaction are to play an important role in its work. The sides noted with satisfaction the stable and even nature of bilateral ties between our countries and spoke in favour of Soviet-Icelandic dialogue at all levels.

### Talks With Icelanders Detailed

*PM0910102790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Meeting with Parliamentarians"]

[Text] On 5 October, A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, met in the Kremlin with a delegation of Iceland's Althing (parliament), which is in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

In the course of constructive, interesting talks special attention was concentrated on European affairs in the context of the profound changes taking place on the continent. It was emphasized that the upcoming conference of heads of state and government of European countries, the United States, and Canada in Paris will be an important step in the building of a new European security system. Parliaments and cooperation among parliaments have a role of their own to play—and it is a considerable one—in this work, in the north of Europe also. This will help to shape the parliamentary dimension of the all-European process.

The Soviet and Icelandic parliamentarians noted with satisfaction the stable and even nature of bilateral ties and advocated deepening the Soviet-Icelandic dialogue at all levels, imparting greater dynamism to interparliamentary contacts, and gearing them toward practical results.

At the request of the Icelandic side, A.I. Lukyanov spoke about the large-scale processes of renewing the economy and political structures in the USSR, emphasizing that, despite the current difficulties, a healthy foundation is being laid for the creation of a democratic model of a socialist state. The Icelandic parliamentarians wished the USSR Supreme Soviet success in its multifaceted work.

## Supreme Soviet

### Supreme Soviet Chambers Meet 8 Oct

*LD0810202590*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1840 GMT on 8 October carries the scheduled 50-minute "USSR Supreme Soviet Report" program, comprising recorded highlights of the 8 October session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

The studio announcer reports that in the morning the Soviet of the Union met and Gerashchenko, chairman of the USSR State Bank, delivered a report on the draft banking law. The USSR State Bank is going to be demonopolized; it will be a system of central republican banks, voluntarily delegating their various powers. The central banks of the Union republics are seen as independent entities in law. The USSR Law on the USSR State Bank and appropriate Union republic laws will govern their activities, Gerashchenko said.

The State Bank will be subordinate only to the USSR Supreme Soviet and no longer to the government. The Supreme Soviet will annually adopt the main guidelines for the fiscal and credits policy and related issues. Thus the system will be more in keeping with the requirements of the market and it will be more flexible. Upper limits of credits will be subject to the law, to make sure that they do not add to the inflationary spiral. The USSR financial system will, in principle, continue to ban foreign currency from domestic dealings. The bank will have the right to buy and sell hard currency in the open market to control the exchange rate of the ruble. Various provisions of the draft law are going to be introduced gradually, so as not to upset the existing system too much.

The USSR Law on Banks and Bank Activity regulates the work of commercial banks. Commercial banks will not be administratively subject to the USSR State Bank and will carry out its instructions only insofar as they are in keeping with the law they are subject to. The session will have to examine a draft decision on the procedure for introducing provisions of the draft law.

AT 1900 GMT, A.K. Orlov, deputy chairman of the Budget and Planning Commission, delivered a report, summarized by announcer. He stressed that the relevant documents were very new and their introduction had to be handled gradually and sensitively.

V.A. Gubarev also spoke on the draft law, praising it but also detailing on its shortcomings. It must be in keeping with other, related laws. He is for adopting the draft law in the first reading.

Grib, Kim, Livashov, Zelinskiy, Boyko, and Khodzyyev also spoke in favor the draft laws. Then deputies' questions were answered by the deputy chairmen of the Planning and Budget Commission. As for cadres, they have to be very talented and well trained. The overall assumption throughout is that the banks will operate within the framework of a single economic zone. Banks will be guided, first and foremost, by economic considerations.

At 1907 GMT, the studio announcer said that the Soviet of Nationalities met in the second half of the day. Gerashchenko was the first to speak, explaining the benefits and purpose of the new draft laws on the banking system in the country. He then answered questions.

At 1908 GMT, Deputy Orlov spoke, praising the draft law on banking. The new system is noteworthy because the fiscal and credit provisions facilitate the transition to the market. Money will now be the responsibility of the banks alone and not the government as has so far been the case. The government must no longer be able to print money as it sees fit. The banks must be subordinate to the law only and not to the government as is the case in the UK and Japan, where it is reflected in the high rate of inflation. Union republican banks will delegate and share their powers with the USSR bank on a voluntary basis alone. Commercial banks must have appropriate conditions and there must be considerable decentralization here. The USSR State Bank will be subject to audits.

Critics say there is no need for this law, because it should first be tried out in the republics. Others say that the future shape of the Union is not known; it is better to wait. Republican banks hand over to the USSR State Bank only two functions: the power of issuing money and the power to control fiscal and credits policy. If republics have their own money, they will have to establish relations with the USSR as any other foreign state on the basis of freely convertible currency.

At 1920 GMT, Gubarev spoke. The USSR State Bank will have various powers to stabilize the economy through interest rates, credits, and so on. Banks will be able to carry out a wide range of operations and services abroad. Banks with a 100-percent initial foreign capital will be able to be set up and operate in the USSR.

At 1926 GMT, the announcer said that Lushchikov, Ordzhinba, and Yablokov also spoke. They wanted the ruble to be retained.

At 1927 GMT, Nishanov spoke. He praised the draft law. Many proposals from deputies and from the republics have been taken into account. Much work remains.

At 1928 GMT, the studio announcer says that a joint session of the chambers of the Supreme Soviet will complete the first reading on 9 October.

### Chambers Meet Separately To Discuss Banking Bills

*LD0810075190 Moscow TASS in English 0739 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Boris Zverev, and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow October 8 TASS—The two chambers of the Soviet parliament today meet separately to discuss the first reading of the bill on the state bank of the USSR and the bill on banks and banking in the Soviet Union.

The bills are being seen as important landmarks along the Soviet road to a market economy.

### Bill Seen as 'Core' of Reform

*LD0810133790 Moscow TASS in English 1258 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[By TASS corresponents Lev Aksenov, Boris Zverev, and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow October 8 TASS—The Council of the Union, one of the two chambers of the Soviet parliament, debated today the first reading of the bills "On the USSR State Bank" and "On Banks and Banking in the USSR".

According to Council Chairman Ivan Laptev, these documents constitute the "core of all the planned reforms" in the country. Head of the USSR State Bank Victor Gerashchenko said they create the "legal foundation for radically reforming the Soviet Union's banking mechanism and its adaptation to current requirements".

"The reform of banking in the country," Deputy Chairman of the Parliamentary Planning and Budget-Financial Commission Aleksandr Orlov pointed out, forms "the triggering mechanism for the transition to a market economy". He said the envisaged radical change in the State Bank's legal status and its demonopolisation were among the most important provisions of the two bills.

Orlov called for vesting the USSR State Bank with the right to issue money and shape a single monetary-credit policy. "If we agree that there must be one monetary unit, there should be also one centre for its emission and for monetary-credit regulation," he said.

The purpose of the two bills, Member of the Planning and Budget-Financial Commission Viktor Gubarev said, is to "create a basically new system to regulate monetary circulation and crediting, making for a materially and financially balanced economy during the country's move to a market economy".

The view was voiced that it was senseless to adopt or discuss the bills at present, since the new federal treaty and the programme for transition to a market economy are not in place yet. This was pointed out, among others, by Deputy Salambek Khadzhiev. However, the idea was not seconded. Aleksandr Orlov said that "we will be holding back perestroika if we wait for the transition to a market economy or for the new federal treaty, without adopting a banking law".

The discussion of the two bills will start after a break in the other house of the Soviet parliament—the Council of Nationalities. The debate of the bills' first reading will be rounded off at a joint meeting of the two chambers.

### Supreme Soviet To Control Bank

*LD0810154390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[Text] As you know, the USSR Supreme Soviet session is continuing its work. Now we are going over to the Kremlin. Lyudmila Semina, our parliamentary correspondent is on the line.

[Semina] Today at the separate sittings of the Supreme Soviet chambers only one, albeit very important, issue is being discussed: the drafts of the law on the USSR State Bank and of the Law on Banks and Bank Activity in the USSR.

The laws are being discussed in the first reading, but they have been thoroughly discussed in the committees and commissions. The Commission for Planning, Budget, and Finance had worked on them for more than two months. Scores of proposals by specialists and several alternative drafts have been analyzed. A study has been carried out on the experience of leading capitalist countries; first and foremost, of the United States. The fifth version of the document is being examined today.

Chairman of the Soviet of the Union Laptev stressed that the core of all our reforms is in these two laws. The transition to market economy begins with the financial recovery and with strengthening the ruble. This is the basic truth. Viktor Vladimirovich Gerashchenko, chairman of the board of the USSR State Bank on behalf of the government and Aleksandr Kondratyevich Orlov and Viktor Andreyevich Gubarev, members of the Commission for Planning, Budget, and Finance on behalf of the Supreme Soviet made reports on the draft of the law.

The draft-laws proposed for discussion envision the radical restructuring of the banking mechanism in the country and adapting it to the needs of the market, not the administrative governing of bank affairs but by economic levers.

A two-level system of banking structure is being introduced. The first level is the state bank and the central banks of the republics. The USSR State Bank is the system of state and central banks of the Union republics. The second level is made up of commercial banks. They are independent from the bodies of state power and management when they make decisions connected with the banks' operational activities. The USSR State Bank establishes the means of payment, whereas the commercial banks are to work with the population.

An important innovation: The State Bank is being removed from the authority of the government and placed under the authority of the Supreme Soviet. As has been said, the government should be deprived of the temptation to print more money. Is the avalanche of spare money to be the reason for our market becoming finally unbalanced? From now on the State Bank is to be

governed only by the law and is to report to the USSR Supreme Soviet. In connection with this the Supreme Soviet is to set up a competent commission.

Finally, about money. This is what is written in the section on the monetary system: the ruble is the only lawful means of payments in the whole of the USSR territory. There is a clause in the law: The use of foreign currency is prohibited inside the country. Well, this is because, otherwise, it will be impossible to stop speculation with foreign currency and, consequently, if foreign currency is used, this will finally choke the ruble.

The use of foreign currency and any other ruble substitutes as a means of payment on the USSR territory is allowed only by the permission of the USSR State Bank that outlines the order and sphere of its circulation; this is what is written in the draft law.

A discussion is going on at the Soviet of the Union at the present moment. It will continue after the break.

### Gerashchenko Presents Bank Bill

*LD0810113290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Our parliamentary correspondent reports from the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

[Correspondent] The country's Supreme Soviet is sitting in separate chambers today. A first reading is being given to the draft laws on the USSR Gosbank. He announced that in drawing up these bills due consideration was given to alternative drafts from the Union parliament committees and commissions and to responses and proposals received from the Union republics.

[Begin Gerashchenko recording] Two draft laws are presented for your scrutiny: the USSR law on the USSR State Bank and the USSR Law on Banks and Banking Activities. The Law on the State Bank is intended to lay the legal foundations for a new model of monetary-credit regulation of the economy and economic methods of supervising the activities of commercial banks. The Law on Banking Activities will set out the chief regulations for banking operations in conditions of economic independence of enterprises and lay down the basic principles for creating a system of commercial banks in the country. The two draft laws create a legal basis for a radical restructuring of the existing banking mechanism and for adapting it to today's requirements. [end recording]

[Correspondent] Deputies Orlov and Gubarev then presented co-reports analyzing the drafts in detail. A debate on the draft laws is under way. [video shows Gerashchenko, Orlov, and Gubarev addressing assembly]

### 'Tentative' Agenda for Week's Session Circulated

*PM0810195690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 1*

["IZVESTIYA Parliamentary Correspondents V. Dolganov and A. Stepovoy Report From the Kremlin: Who Should Be Gosbank's Boss?"]

[Excerpts] This week the USSR Supreme Soviet began work in separate chambers. First, on 8 October, the Soviet of the Union held a session under the chairmanship of I.D. Laptev. The deputies began their first-reading examination of the draft Law on the State Bank [Gosbank] and Law on Banks and Banking Activity in the USSR. The report was delivered by V.S. Gerashchenko, chairman of the Gosbank Board. [passage omitted]

On the first day of the week a new tentative schedule for the work of the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet was circulated. It is proposed this week, apart from examining the aforementioned draft laws, to finish voting on the draft law on public associations, and also to ratify a number of international conventions, particularly the Treaty Between the USSR and the United States on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests and the Treaty Between the USSR and the United States on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. The Supreme Soviet has included on its agenda for this week the previously scheduled ratification of an amendment to the composition of the USSR Council of Ministrers and the fist reading of the Fundamentals of USSR and Union Republic Legislation on Employment of the Population.

The agenda for next week includes a report by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze on his ministry's work on legal and treaty support for the USSR's interests and security. Among economic laws, the first-reading discussion of the draft law on currency regulation is scheduled. Our legislators also plan to examine draft laws on railroad transport, on accountability for blocking transport routes, and on amendments to the 4 June 1982 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree on Compulsory State Insurance for Passengers in Air, Railroad, Internal Maritime, Water, and Motor Transportation. And finally a USSR Council of Ministers report on measures to prepare for the winter is to be heard 17 October.

As you will recall, 15 October was the date by which the authors of the market transition programs were to submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet a single, agreed final version of the economic program for the country's development. We can see that this question, which is very important to all of us, has not yet been submitted for examination.

## Deputies Want Nuclear Test Treaties Ratified

*PM0810155590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 1*

[IZVESTIYA parliamentary correspondent report: "Stormy Discussions Over Moratorium"]

[Text] A joint sitting of the International Affairs Committee and the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions was held at the USSR Supreme Soviet. The longest exchange of opinions revolved around the first item on the agenda: examining the question of ratifying the 1974 and 1976 Treaties on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests and on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. The United States and the USSR have observed these agreements throughout this period. The U.S. Congress ratified them not so long ago. Our turn has come.

One would have thought that the documents should not have caused such animated debates. Signed many years ago, they have operated faultlessly. However, the treaties served as an excuse for deputies to discuss a number of other aspects of disarmament and arms control—and opposing opinions emerged among the parliamentarians in their assessment of these issues.

The speeches delivered by three speakers from the Foreign Ministry, the Defense Ministry, and an independent group of experts set up by the committees revealed marked differences of position. No one objected to the the ratification of the treaties. However, Lieutenant General S. Zelentsov assessed the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests declared by the USSR in August 1985—which, as is well known, lasted 18 months—as a failure, as a result of which new developments in the field of nuclear weapons were not approved, money was wasted to no purpose on idle workers and specialists, and many research programs were held up. In his opinion, had the ban on tests lasted longer, it would have seen the degradation of the country's scientific potential.

Academician G. Arbatov resolutely opposed this assessment of the moratorium. The moratorium, which the Soviet Union extended on three occasions, he said, contributed to creating the atmosphere which made it possible to hold the crucial USSR-U.S. summit in Reykjavik.

Ye. Velikhov, A. Ananyev, V. Falin, and others addressed the committees' sitting. Deputies were divided roughly into two groups which adhered to the following opinions. Some believed that most resolute steps, including unilateral steps, should be taken in the disarmament sphere. Their opponents objected to unilateral steps, which cannot convince anyone to follow an example and will only damage the country's security.

Despite their differences, both committees' deputies instructed the Supreme Soviet to ratify the treaties and urge the world's parliaments to completely stop nuclear tests.

With regard to other items on the agenda, representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations briefed deputies on the balance of oil and petroleum products in USSR trade. "Black gold" is regrettably still virtually the only major source of hard currency. What is more, the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations offers 55 states aid free of charge. This aid totaled 800 million rubles this year and is carried out in accordance with previous pledges. Vietnam, Cuba, Nicaragua, and Afghanistan are the largest recipients. However, the volumes of aid are dropping year by year.

## PRAVDA Reports on Treaty Recommendations

*PM0510093290 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2*

[Report by V. Izgarshev: "In the Interests of Peace and Security"]

[Text] A joint sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee and the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions was held in the Kremlin yesterday chaired by A. Dzasokhov. It examined nuclear weapons agreements signed by the Soviet Union and the United States.

After studying the relevant materials and hearing reports from USSR Foreign Ministry and USSR Defense Ministry representatives, along with reports from experts, the people's deputies gave their findings on the two treaties and their protocols. They resolved to recommend that the Supreme Soviet ratify these important interstate agreements. They are the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests signed in Moscow 3 July 1974 and the protocol to it signed in Washington 1 June 1990. And the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes signed in Moscow and Washington 28 May 1976 and the protocol to it signed in Washington 1 June 1990.

USSR People's Deputies G. Arbatov, Ye. Velikhov, N. Petrushenko, V. Shabanov, and other comrades spoke at the sitting. They all pointed out that the ratification of these documents will serve to further stabilize international relations and serve the interests of peace and security for others in addition to our two countries' peoples.

## Supreme Soviet Committees, Commissions Meet 5 Oct

### Committee Views Nuclear Pollution

*LD0510180990*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1130 GMT on 5 October carries a nine-minute report by correspondent Andrey Nikiforov on the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions.

He notes that the Industrial Commission examined some questions connected with the implenmentation of the law on enterprises, the Ministry of Internal Affairs made an appeal on behalf of its enterprises, the Commission for the Development of Union and Autonomous Republics, Oblasts, and Okrugs is preparing its conclusions on the draft on employment. The SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA article "Dangerous Passage" written by state planning specialists, is being considered by a number of committees and commissions. The author and representatives of a number of ministries and departments are attending a meeting of the Commission for Planning, Budget, and Finance, at which deputies from other committees and commissions are also present.

Nikiforov goes on to describe the meeting of the Ecology Committee, which is conducting a hearing on the ecological situation in Chelyabinsk Oblast resulting from "decades of abuse" by the nuclear power industry. Chaired by Aleksandr Nikolayevich Penyagin, "one of the leaders" of the committee, who actually comes from Chelyabinsk, the meeting is attended by representatives of the Ministry of Power and Electrification and other ministries and departments.

Nikiforov interviews Penyagin during a break in the proceedings. Penyagin begins by recalling the history of Chelyabinsk Oblast's ecological problems. Weapon-grade plutonium for the first Soviet atomic bomb had to be developed hastily in time for Stalin's birthday, Penyagin says. From then on, Chelyabinsk Oblast became a victim of the Ministry of the Nuclear Power Industry. The Techa River became heavily polluted by the dumping of radioactive effluent straight into the water, without regard for the safety of people living by the river. This form of waste disposal operated from 1949 to 1952, he says; it was only when people began to die that attention was drawn to the hazard, and the survivors were evacuated. Little else was done.

In 1957, Penyagin continues, there was the Kachtym accident [Kachtymskaya avariya] in which a storage tank containing radioactive material exploded with devastating effect, releasing 20 million curies into the atmosphere—the world's first accident of this kind. Chernobyl released 50 million curies. The accident at Kachtym affected Chelyabinsk, Sverdlovsk, Kurgan, and Tyumen Oblasts. At least 271,000 people were subjected to its effects.

Penyagin says that Lake Karachey was also used as a dumping site for both high and low-concentration radioactive material, with the result that it now contains 20 million curies—the equivalent of two-and-a-half Chernobyls. Water is naturally seeping from the lake into the surrounding area, polluting large volumes of subsoil water. In 1967, a hot summer followed a dry winter. The water evaporated and the dust from the bottom of the lake was blown over a vast area, "up to 75 km long", affecting 41,000 people. The two accidents have caused chronic ailments in about 1,000 people—three times as many as in the case of Chernobyl.

At present, the USSR has 500 million cubic meters of radioactive open water, which could, in theory, cause irreparable harm to 7.5 million people who live near the rivers Iset, Irtysh, and Ob.

Nikiforov then raises the question of the South Urals nuclear plant which is to be built in the affected area. Penyagin explains that the aim is to use the plant to begin to evaporate the contaminated water, since it cannot realistically be contained.

The plant would also solve another problem. He says: "Four of the five reactors making weapons-grade plutonium—that is, plutonium that is used in the manufacture of nuclear warheads—these reactors are being taken out of service, and over 4,000 people are without work—people, incidentally, of the highest professional standing, a whole school of nuclear scientists set up in our country over those years." These people could be employed in the new plant.

However, the South Urals area has suffered so much over the years that there is great reluctance to acquiesce in the construction of another nuclear installation, and the Ecology Committee is scrutinizing every detail of the proposed plant.

Nikiforov thanks Penyagin for his contribution and brings the report to an end at this point.

### Commission Discusses Folk Art

*LD0510215590*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1915 GMT on 5 October broadcasts a seven-minute report by correspondent Polikarpova from the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission for the Development of Culture, Language, National and International Traditions and Protection of Historical heritage which discussed the state of folk art and culture.

Polikarpova begins by noting that Deputy Shuvalov asserted that the committee is called on to rehabilitate and restore ethnic cultures.

Deputies Yerelina and Solovyev attended Gorbachev's recent meeting on culture, at which the vital need to preserve the best traditions was affirmed. Solovyev says that the president is aware of the importance of the issues and expounds on the opportunities for reviving traditional industries and crafts. Shuvalov adds that such crafts must be of the highest artistic value.

### Presidium Rules on Vandalism

*LD0610112690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2252 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has decided to increase liability for outrages against the country's state symbols and for acts of vandalism against historical and cultural monuments.

## Political & Social

### CPSU Central Committee Plenum Meets 8 Oct

#### Topics Include Economy, Other Matters

*PM0910104190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1*

["Information Report on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Plenum started its work 8 October 1990. The following questions were submitted for examination by the plenum:

1. On the situation in the country and the CPSU's tasks in connection with the transition of the economy to market relations.

2. Organizational questions.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, opened the plenum with an introductory speech.

V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave an address on the first question.

The plenum heard a briefing by A.S. Dzasokhov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on the work of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat during the period since 28th Party congress and a report by O.S. Shenin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on the CPSU Central Committee commissions and apparatus.

Taking part in the plenum's work are: members of the CPSU Central Control Commission; first secretaries of union and autonomous republics and of kray, oblast, and okrug party committees who are not members of the central CPSU organs; USSR people's deputies from the CPSU; scientists; editors of party newspapers; and representatives of certain departments and organizations.

The following took part in the discussions: S.A. Kalinin, secretary of the Rybinsk Motor-Building Production Association Party Committee, Yaroslav Oblast; I.I. Melnikov, secretary of the Moscow M.V. Lomonosov State University Party Committee; S.I. Gurenko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; B.P. Guseletov, senior lecturer at the Sverdlovsk Engineering and Pedagogical Institute; Yu. A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City party committee; A.S. Kamay, second secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; V.S. Lipitskiy, chief of department at the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism and member of the organizational bureau of the communist reformers' section of the Democratic Platform in the CPSU; L.P. Kravchenko, general director of TASS; I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee; M.A. Chartayev, chairman of the Ordzhonikidze Kolkhoz [Collective Farm], Dagestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic; R.A. Medvedev, writer and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet; U. Karamanov, chairman of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers; B.V. Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Leningrad party obkom [oblast committee]; A.K. Morkunas, tractor driver at the "Tveryachyus" kolkhoz in the Lithuanian SSR; R.M. Khudaybergenov, first secretary of the Khorezm Uzbek Communist Party Obkom; V.Ya. Demin, operator at the Ivanovo P.S. Baturin Chemical Plant; M.F. Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting; V.D. Kadochnikov, first secretary of the Sverdlovsk party obkom; V.I. Savina, spinner at the Chernigov Textile-Sewing Goods Production and Trading Association, Ukrainian SSR; A.N. Maltsev, senior lecturer at the Gorkiy Agricultural Institute; A.N. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee; L.V. Potapov, first secretary of the Buryat republic party committee; V.Kh. Banbayev, secretary of the Kalmyk republic party Committee; and A.A. Gusev, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee and first secretary of the Morskiy Estonian Communist Party Rayon Committee, Tallinn. An editorial commission was created to prepare a plenum resolution. The CPSU Central Committee plenum will resume its work 9 October.

### Gorbachev Speaks to Plenum

*LD0810174590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1552 GMT 8 Oct 90*

["At the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] Moscow, 8 Oct (TASS)—Topical problems of the country's present-day political and socio-economic situation, and the party's tasks stemming from this are at the center of attention for participants in a CPSU Central Committee plenum. It opened in the capital today.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, opened the plenum with an introductory speech:

**Introductory speech of M.S. Gorbachev**

There is a somewhat unusual proposal. First, that the plenum be held in such a way that it fits into two days. Why into two days? Because a strong desire by people to speak on these questions was made known on the eve of the plenum. And no doubt the importance of the first issue is such that one cannot rush things in this case, the more so since there is a second question as well.

And one more proposal. Taking into consideration the fact that discussion at the plenum will range over the whole set of issues, concerning both the positions of the CPSU in connection with the market, and also concerning the work of the Central Committee, it would be possible, following the report of Comrade Ivashko on the first question, to give the floor immediately to Comrade Dzasokhov for a statement on the work of the Central

Committee Secretariat during the period which has followed the 28th congress, and to Comrade Shenin for a statement on the commissions and the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee; and then discuss everything together.

No doubt this will give comrades the opportunity to bear in mind all the information, which is simply essential in this case.

Before giving the floor to Comrade Ivashko, I would also like to say something to you by way of a brief opening speech, if you do not object. This a four-stage system. Twenty minutes is envisaged for the opening speech, Comrades Dzasokhov and Shenin 15 minutes each, and the reader of the report up to an hour. Is that not so, Vladimir Antonovich? And then debates—10 minutes at a time. That is all I had to say on the procedure. What has occurred to you, comrades, are there any questions?

Voice: Agreed.

M.S. Gorbachev. Can we get moving? Things will become clear as we go along. All right, then we accept the procedure proposed.

Before going over to discussion of the issues on the agenda and giving the floor to the report reader, permit me to express some views.

The fact that the party's tasks are mentioned on the agenda is not accidental. In the preceding months we paid a great deal of attention to an analysis of the situation that has taken shape in the country. A critical and responsible approach has allowed us to work out political guidelines for the future. Here, first and foremost, I have in mind the decisions of the 28th party congress and others.

I think that at this Central Committee plenum one must concentrate on the work of the party within the context of the current situation. At the present time the most important thing for us is to switch the activity of the party organizations, of party committees, and of all communists over to practical deeds, to constructive work. We all feel, and you will probably confirm this, that this is the mood of the majority of communists and, no less important—and perhaps even more important—this is the mood in society as a whole as well.

The issue of the need to elaborate clear-cut political guidelines was raised sharply on the eve of the congress. Now we have them and one should take action. This is very serious. At this difficult and crucial time for the country, we cannot allow the party to waste political energy and its potential on arguments about individual—even if important—problems, on clarifing shades and nuances in positions, or to concentrate exclusively on intraparty issues. Otherwise, it runs the risk of losing its authority in the masses. And this is impermissible both for the party itself, its present and future, and, primarily, from the positions of our great cause—restructuring.

If one looks for analogies, the current period can be compared with the period of transition to the New Economic Policy [NEP] in the twenties. Now, as was the case then, society is at a turning point. The NEP required the communists to radically change their forms of thinking and methods of action. That was one of the party's hardest trials. And the fact that at the time many did not understand the depth of the Leninist idea and its importance for the destiny of the revolution, saw the NEP as a tactical move, at best, and some communists, including those in the party leadership, rejected the new approach altogether—all that has had hard consequences for the country and the prestige of the socialist idea. How well we know this already.

In essence, the CPSU has come up against a test of similar scale in this current stretch of history, too. The party's ability to retain its status of a ruling party and its historical destiny, as well, will depend to a decisive degree on the way the party acts during the conditions of the country's transition to the market, of during the reformation our multinational state and forming new political structures in society. And the most important thing is that success of reforms depends on this to a great degree, due to the enormous influence and the role the party plays in our society. It does so, despite the fact that there are various views on this score, and quite a few opinions dictated by a desire to belittle the party's significance or to place it in a difficult situation.

What, more than anything, prevents the party from being up to the challenge of the times? The root of this is wholly in the inertia of the old way of thinking. It is precisely in this that I see a danger which really threatens the party. It is the danger of letting the initiative slip—when changes in society which have come to a head are there to be seen. And, as is known, a vacuum does not just occurr in nature, but also in society and in politics. And we can already see that attempts are being made to squeeze the party out, to fill the political spectrum of our society with a different content, especially where its position is felt to be weak.

As some of our party comrades are aware, the current, deep changes in society are not being perceived as a manifestation of a historical trend which, one way or another, was bound to pave a way for itself. As far as they are concerned, what is currently taking place is a result of arbitrariness, miscalculations, slip-ups—more than that, of designs by certain people. This, comrades, is a delusion. Of course, as we can now see, many things could have been done differently, better; we did miscalculate as far as some things are concerned. But this turnabout is in itself inevitable. It is inevitable. The country could not have continued to live like that; it was bound to have embarked upon a path of radical changes.

I see the current plenum's task in deepening the understanding of this central issue—thus, the necessity of this turnabout, in overcoming hesitations and resolutely speaking out for strengthening constructive work by

communists on the basis of such an understanding, those fateful decisions which were adopted by the 28th party congress.

At the 28th congress, the CPSU took up a precise and clear-cut position on the market. This was done, as you remember, as a result of broad discussion and serious scientific analysis. We had to review stereotypes and dogmas that were established over decades, and throw out much that was considered to be immovable. All of our past ideology presented socialism as the antipode to the market, while the recognition of the market was considered to be an encroachment upon socialism. Yes, we are encroaching upon socialism, but only that socialism which was built in a bureaucratic way, and under which the country turned off the road on which it embarked in 1917.

Now, when the process of joining the market is acquiring real outlines, an intensive search is underway for an optimum transfer to it; a clash of views is taking place, and the party must switch on all of its creative and political potential in order to assist this process in the spirit of the decisions the congress made, and to ensure through its work among the masses that it gets the broad support of the working people.

I think that the discussion of this question, which is vitally important to our society, will proceed along these lines at the Central Committee plenum. This discussion is also of important significance to us because preparation of the program for the transfer to the market has now gone into the final stage. Everything positive which is contained in various drafts and proposals will be accumulated in it. As is known, in accordance with the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, this work is proceeding under the leadership of the country's president. We are talking, not about some kind of compromise document in which the corners are smoothed out and positions eroded, but about a program around which it will be possible to consolidate all layers of society, all the union, autonomous republics, public organizations and political movements. In general, all the patriotic forces of our society.

One of the most important tasks of the party, as I see it, is helping society to rid itself of predjudices and fears of the market. Indeed, one cannot agree with all kinds of speculations, like the one which claims that a transition to the market is a betrayal of the workers' interests and a restoration of capitalist exploitation. And there are such notions even among the communists.

Of course, transition to the market is not a joke. We are talking about reforming society's whole way of life, moreover, in such a country like ours—overburdened with problems, with its unique historical, psychological, ethnic, and economic characteristics and opportunities. It is important to understand that this transition is being dictated wholly by the interests of man and its aim is to create an effective, human-oriented economy and conditions for encouraging the talents, industriousness, and deep interest in the results of work. It is clear to us now that only through the market economy can we finally break away from working only on command, from the free-ride mentality and unwarranted leveling, monopolism and shortages, and, as a consequence of this, the widespread extortionism, bribe-taking, profiteering, and other manifestations of the shadow economy.

Under the market conditions, the possibilities of realizing the socialist principle of from each according to his ability, to each according to his work are opening up. The modern market assumes the state regulation of the social and economic processes by the use of legislative acts and a developed system of social guarantees, and social protection for the population. And, to be more precise, this means the introduction of the new social policy.

One economic model has one social policy, for another, the market model of the economy, a new social policy is needed. So communists should involve themselves with a clear conscience on working on implementing the policy of transition to the market. People are concerned about the property question. Everyone agrees that the cause of our numerous economic and social ills is the state monopoly on property, which turns it into something belonging to no one and undermines stimuli to work and economic initiative. There is an understanding of the need for diversity for forms of property. But when it comes to specifics, there arises incomprehension, even objections. Many are simply afraid that, as a result of its removal from the state, ambit property will fall into the hands of the smart operators of the shadow economy, the new rich. I see the party's task in bringing home to the people the true meaning of the planned reforms in property relations, in showing that provision will be made for reliable guarantees that ensures the working people's participation in the process of dismantling state ownership. It is the labor collectives themselves which must primarily become the owners of enterprises. It is precisely such an approach that is being incorporated into the program for a transition to a market. And, of course, the state will retain control of such key sectors as the power an fuel industry, transport and communications, and defense sector of the economy, etc.

A problem of enormous social importance is ownership of land. The party has been advocating and is advocating diverse forms of organizing production and economic management in the rural sector. We are in favor of immediately addressing the task of providing social facilities to the countryside, and of supplying it with the necessary machinery and resources.

This position is most fully expressed in the decisions of the March (1989) Central Committee plenum and the 28th congress program statement. The CPSU has been in favor and is in favor of various forms of owning the means of production in rural areas. As regards land, then one of the most effective forms of using it, allowing man to become the master of it, is long-term leasing with the

possibility of bequeathing plots of land and the means of production and, under certain conditions, leasing rights.

I want to stress once again: Our principled approach is that we are in favor of a variety of forms of land management. Let the people decide everything forthemselves.

Comrades, in recent years we have all recognized that you cannot count just on the success of perestroyka as a whole, but on the solution of specific problems as well—economic and social—without reforming our multinational state. Now, I would say. that that is acquiring decisive significance, practically everything rests upon that. What is happening in that vitally important sphere of our society is giving rise to great anxiety and alarm, to quite a few critical remarks and judgements. Not fearing fine-sounding words, it may be said that it is a question of the fate of our motherland.

We have entered a phase of real change in our multinational state and should see all the salutary changes which this process entails, as well as the dangers which are also at hand. Those who want to say that everything is bad in the present process are wrong—that contradicts the moods of those people who link the national revival of their peoples and republics with the new policy.

But those who take account of this aspect alone, who do not see the danger, including the tendencies threatening our union, community, and the cohabitation of our peoples are also wrong.

The CPSU is in favor of national rebirth, of the sovereignty, independence, and self-government of peoples. The main question is how to implement this aim in the specific conditions of our country, taking account of its history, of the cultural, psychological, and spiritual ties which have taken shape, of demographic factors, of the multilayered nature and the settlement distribution of the peoples, and of security needs.

An analysis of all the circumstances and the experience of recent years show that the optimum way to revive people and to implement their independence lies in the profound transformation of our multinational state and the creation of a union of sovereign states. In other words, not by way of destruction and disintegration, but by way of integration in its contemporary forms. For this reason, the CPSU is resolutely against separatism, against wrecking the destructive actions from whomsoever these may emanate. And at the same time, the party is in favor of the profound renewal of our multinational state.

Communists have no more important task today than to oppose the pressure of separatist forces. This also concerns communist deputies of soviets and all levels, because in a number of cases we are encountering the adoption of anticonstitutional decisions which are paralyzing the activities of the bodies of authority and government, and destabilizing the situation in the country. Here lie the roots of the law and order violations and the economic difficulties which are being heavily reflected in peoples' lives. Let us speak straight: If these tendencies are not overcome and are allowed to develop further, then the country may really be threatened with "Lebanonization" with all its well-known consequences.

I think you will have seen our television correspondent last week in Lebanon, speaking against the background of ruined towns about what the feuding, struggle, and confrontation have led to. It used to be one of the most prosperous countries in the world, but today the Lebanese man with whom our correspondent spoke said he wanted to flee the country.

Communists must do all they can to prevent such a "Lebanonization" taking place here. And to this end, the false and speculative nature of the arguments and slogans of extremist and nationalist forces must be exposed. Deceiving the people and without sparing resources, they will create an atmosphere of national hatred and terror. In such circumstances, people are afraid to say everything they think. Communists must expose the insidious tactics of nationalists and extremists. What are needed here are both bold and true words and the force of law.

By virtue of the particularly crucial nature of the moment, I see it as essential to raise at the plenum the question of the responsibility of the mass media. It is abnormal and it contradicts the principles of democracy and glasnost when there is an attempt to foist one-sided, subjective views on society, making them out to be the view of the people. It is unacceptable when in certain mass media malicious and diabolical actions, and sometimes even the orgies of elements behaving like fascists, are almost made out to be manifestations of democracy, while the fact that the people resolutely reject and condemns them remains, as the saying goes, out of the picture. What kind of glasnost is this, and what kind of democracy? No, this cannot be seen otherwise than as the abuse of glasnost for the purposes of incitement.

And why do communists in the mass media remain silent? I believe that members of the Central Committee should also maintain constant contact with editorial offices, visit them and take part in discussions rather than simply send telegrams to the party Central Committee demanding the adoption of administrative measures. Primarily this is a political task. Public, open discussion is needed, preferably with the participation of representatives of other public organizations and all those who have a real interest in the success of our cause and the destiny of our country. The role of journalists is extraordinarily great now and we hope that a feeling of responsibility before the people will suggest to each of them a true position.

The CPSU is resolutely opposed to outrages against monuments to Lenin, against symbols of our statehood and our national culture, against the graves of servicemen who fell fighting in the defense of the fatherland. People demand that resolute measures be taken. A decree of the president on this issue has been prepared

and is now being pronounced upon [nakhoditsya na zaklyuchenii] in the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The republican and local bodies of power must take a firm position on this. It is the duty of Communists to support public opinion, which comes out against acts of vandalism.

In the present situation, tasks of a strategic and of an everyday character have become entwined in one tight knot as never before. As the ruling party, we must understand this well in order to think and act in the appropriate way in all areas. It has to be said directly: If in the very near future we do not find the approach and do not display the will, if we do not use our potential for uniting the working people in the resolution of such issues as the normalization of the consumer market; the strengthening of law and order and discipline in society, of legality and of the authority of power, and the observance of obligations under agreements, then our long-term aims might also find themselves in question.

Today tactical tasks emerge directly into strategy. And the question of restoring and raising the authority of communists and of the party as a whole is connected with this.

People will judge the party according to how communists do in the harvest, in the preparation of the national economy for winter in towns and settlements, in the bringing of order to railway and municipal transport, and in everything that is connected with day-to-day life.

The facts go to show that this is primarily what will determine the attitude towards the communists. Party oranizations which have displayed initiative in all these matters gain people's approval and support. In Moscow, a long time was spent holding public meetings concerning whether to help with the harvest or not. Meanwhile, it was raining every day, and none of the equipment was working, so human hands were needed. I asked Yu.A.Prokofyev to call together the managers who are communists. About 450 of them gathered. Yuriy Anatolyevich said to them: The situation is this, Mikhail Sergeyevich has appealed to us, and I am appealing on behalf of the city committee—let us do something. They replied: There is no question, let us rouse Moscow. And they sent 60,000 people to the harvest, while many collectives are participating on an occasional basis.

Here we all are, discussing what communists are to do now. Be together with the people, suffer these times with it, help it to bolster its spirits and to organize and tackle practical affairs. That is the whole answer. How this will be implemented depends on the specific situation in a collective, a people, a republic.

Towards the same end we must give total support to the soviets at all levels, help them to find their feet more quickly and to avoid the public meeting style of politics in their work. Taking experience into account, it is evidently already necessary to make adjustments to the relationship between the soviets and the executive committees, and to refine the distribution of functions, powers, and responsibility.

I think that we should support the working through of these questions which is being carried out in committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

In today's conditions, when political pluralism and a multiparty situation are becoming a reality in our country, the skill of the party to cooperate with other political trends and organizations acquires special significance. At the congress we already stated our readiness to enter into a coalition with all progressive patriotic forces. Such a coalition can now be based on an anti-crisis program, meeting the interests of the entire people and all of its strata.

And another point is tied up with this: You know about the meeting which took place recently with cultural figures. The main idea in speeches by comrades was the collective role of culture. The interest of the creative intelligentsia in cooperation with the party and with state power, to defend cultural values, to revive culture, and to turn it into a unifying factor in our multinational society, was voiced vigorously. Many ideas and proposals were expressed on which I would like to focus your attention—they must not remain wishes waiting to be picked up.

In concluding the opening speech, I want to stress once again: The party will be able to overcome the internal crisis and restore its political worth in the eyes of the people if communists, having rolled up their sleeves, help to resolve the problems which face the country and which alarm our entire people.

## Ivashko Reports to Plenum

*PM0910113090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Oct 90 pp 2-3*

[Report by V. A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 8 October CPSU Central Committee Plenum in Moscow: "Report of V.A. Ivashko"]

[Text] Comrades! At the present plenum all of us, members of the newly composed Central Committee, are to translate into the language of concrete actions the decisions of the XXVIII CPSU Congress, relating first of all to the sphere of socioeconomic policy.

Communists hope to hear from the CPSU Central Committee what needs to be done in the first place, how they should act for the best in the face of the exacerbating socioeconomic and political crisis.

The temperature of our long-sick and seriously ill society has reached the critical mark. The volume of production is being cut, there is a chain reaction under way in the disintegration of economic links, discipline is getting worse. Total shortage, speculation, the rise in prices, the

stricken consumer market, are poisoning the life of millions of Soviet people from day to day. The situation regarding providing Moscow and Leningrad and other industrial centers with foodstuffs has become simply intolerable. The criminal world which is terrorizing the population is growing insolent. The hot-beds of interethnic strife and conflicts are not dying down. The polarization of political forces is continuing, anti-socialist trends are growing more active, attempts to drive the CPSU out into the backyard of social life are increasing. To this end, nothing short of the unbridled defamation and persecution of communists are being carried out. The "image of the enemy" in the person of the CPSU is being instilled into the public consciousness.

All that in its totality has whipped up social tension to dangerous limits.

On the eve of the plenum, members of the Central Committee, members of the Politburo and Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee, and officials on the apparatus visited many republican and oblast party organizations, and met party and soviet activists, working people and communists in the production collectives.

Familiarization with the situation leads one to conclude that there have been no marked improvements in the vital activity of party committees in the post congress period. In many places political limpness, confusion and a lack of practical action are in evidence. The expectation of directions and instructions, of exhaustive "directives from above" for all eventualities in life is still alive. Or course, we have to take a certain share of the blame for such a situation, but we also have to lay a share of it at the door of those who should have done their jobs in the localities. But this isn't the main point at present. The main point is that in this entire situation there are plenty of people who are beginning to lose faith in the party, and becoming disillusioned with its policy, perestroyka. The Central Committee is being reproached ever more sharply and frequently for sluggishness and lack of initiative, and for an inability to bring home to the broad masses of communists and non-party members their position on the most burning issues of social development.

In searching for a way out of the crisis, the 28th CPSU Congress clearly and definitely advocated market relations, and fundamental, radical changes in all spheres of society's life. Of course, it was not easy to embark on this step, knowing that it signified a real revolution in social consciousness, in social practice. And life has borne out the apprehensions which existed. Debates in the press, letters to party organs, including the CPSU Central Committee, and arguments at party meetings testify that in itself the economy's transition to market relations is being received in a way that is far from unequivocal, guardedly, and at times is even simply rejected.

Besides this, people are asking a great many questions of a political, socioeconomic, and moral and ethical nature in connection with this transition. They require clear and precise replies. And they have to be given. The more so as in the eyes of many people the transition to market relations is associated with the restoration of capitalism and the dismantling of socalist orders and guarantees.

It goes without saying that it is not a question of the Central Committee plenum, as it were, again "mulling over" options of programs for switching to the market which have become a matter for consideration at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. The plenum is faced with defining the place and the tasks of party organizations, of all communists in the practical work of stabilizing the economy and switching to market relations, and outlining a plan of action flowing from the needs of the moment and the current political and socioeconomic situation in the country. It goes without saying that it is not a question of who has to do what tomorrow and the day after. The main thing lies in something else—in defining today at the plenum a stance which party organizations could be guided by in their specific practical work.

So, firstly, concerning the stabilization of the economy as the prime task of the moment.

It is impossible to explain the difficult economic situation in terms of the defects of an ineffective and obsolete system of economic management alone, although herein lies the main cause of the crisis phenomena. Also to blame are the serious miscalculations that have been permitted of late.

The dismantling of the former administration system, in essence, has been carried out in a short period of time, but the introduction of new economic regulators and transition proper to the market relations have impermissibly lingered. Things got swamped in arguments, conversations, and expectations of changes. The quality of the work of ministries lowered abruptly which has resulted in the loss of sector administration and imbalance. There is no market, but its worst part—spontaneity—is present. It is no secret that without any economic regulators many things in our economy have been held together by party discipline. Now the situation has changed. Party committees are abandoning direct execution of economic functions, and the logic of transformations becomes manifest in this fact.

The main burden during the transition period should have fallen on the surviving sector management organs and the soviets. But they have not yet found their proper place in administration of the economy and social sphere.

The failure of some enterprises to meet their contractual obligations to others, the increase in the loss of work time—in 8 months of this year alone, 10 million man-days were lost owing to strikes—the uncompensated closure of a number of enterprises, including, incidentally, some manufacturing medicines, interethnic conflicts, and the sharp drop in the supply of raw materials, have caused a drop in production volumes. In the

country as a whole, the output of industrial production has decreased by 0.9 percent over the last nine months, including a drop of 9.1 percent in Azerbaijan, 7.2 percent in Armenia, 4.1 percent in Lithuania, 2 percent in Estonia, and 1.3 percent in Latvia.

The complete chaos of the money and credit sphere is making itself painfully felt. The overfilling of the channels of circulation with money, both cash and non-cash, has upset the money system and caused the fall in the purchasing power of the ruble. The government program for financial improvement adopted at the end of the last year has turned out not to be very effective.

Comrades! No economy, neither a market, nor an administrative command-based economy can function when it is an uncontrolled growth in money supply. Unless the swamping of the internal market with money that is not backed up with anything is stopped immediately, the transition to market relations as a means of creating a new economy will simply be untenable and will produce nothing but social upheaval.

With an emission plan for the year of 10 billion rubles [R], the emission of money over the last 9 months has in fact comprised R19.3 billion. That is more than for 1981-1985 taken together. The astronomical sums tossed into circulation, along with other factors, are bringing about panic demand, raising prices on markets, causing shortages and passport and ration-card purchases and, as a consequence, more and more layers of profiteers. The small increases in pay and pensions made in recent years have been reduced to naught.

Are there objective conditions for such a large issuance of money? There is one answer—no. Judge for yourselves. Over the first six months, with an emission of R9.7 billion, banks issued to cooperative members alone R12 billion more in cash, more than they received from them for crediting their account. The link between these two amounts is not direct, but there is a link, and a very close one. Why has no one taken an interest in this phenomenon? Why is money given out at the first demand—which complicates the already complex situation in the country? Incidentally, the Ukraine took an interest in this a year ago, and as a result the issuance in the republic is now comparatively six to seven times lower than in the Union.

Republican and local bodies are trying to get out of the difficult situation individually, often by means of a new administration which makes the economic confusion worse.

As a result the level of state discipline is dropping. To take, for example, the tobacco problem, the hold-ups with sales of bread and other hold-ups in satisfying the elementary needs of millions of people. Behind them and other similar shortages there are not any kind of serious objective reasons, but there is unpardonable irresponsibility, bungling, crude errors by central and local bodies.

The destructive position of individual political forces has of late been having a negative effect on the work of the national economy. Some of them, without concealing it, act on the principle "the worse the better," and are counting on satisfying their own political ambitions on a wave of people's dissatisfaction with the economic situation.

Urgent actions and an urgent optimization of structures of management from the top to the bottom are needed. The decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet "on measures to stabilize the economic and sociopolitical life of the country, investing the President with additional powers," is in this connection fully justified.

This step, directed at reinforcing state power, raising discipline and law and order, is considered by the Central Committee Politburo to be an indispensable condition for guaranteeing [normal] life for the country, and also advancement along the road to a market economy.

In our opinion the whole party has to provide the utmost support for the President, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Government, republican and local bodies of power in their efforts directed at leading society out of the crisis situation.

Comrades! The main task of the day is to normalize the consumer market, balance the population's incomes and expenditures, and in order to do this it is necessary first and foremost to increase the supply of goods on the market and boost production. Warnings reaching the CPSU Central Committee witness the fact that because of the abrupt worsening of material and technical provision, including reduced supplies of imported raw materials and components, enterprises of light industry and other sectors could shortly find themselves in a difficult situation. We cannot let this happen. The task of preserving economic ties which have formed, execution of economic treaties and adjustment of material and technical supplies is coming now into the foreground. Decisive actions are here to be taken by all communists, regardless of where they work.

It is no secret that the situation on the consumer market is being aggravated by speculative demand and various rumors, right up to talk about impending famine. For this reason people are rightly asking: What awaits us in the near future?

It can be stated with full responsibility that such talk is groundless. The harvest that has been grown in the main crops is higher than in preceding years. In spite of all the difficulties with the weather, it is possible and necessary to correct the situation with supplying the towns with livestock produce, potatoes, and vegetables.

To balance the population's monetary incomes and expenditures, along with saturating the market with traditional consumer goods, in the very near future new advantageous spheres for the investment of accumulated

funds have to be presented. Nor should resolution of the question of raising interest rates on money deposits be delayed.

Notwithstanding all the diversity of opinions on specific paths and stages of transferring to market relations, it seems that there is unity in understanding, that without a harsh credit and finance policy and a strong ruble of full value, any normal functioning of the national economy, including stabilization of the market, is impossible.

I consider it essential to support the proposal on extraordinary measures to remove the present budget deficit, and to limit the mass of money in circulation. We should start implementing them immediately.

Special attention should be paid to questions of regulating monetary incomes. We are not talking about freezing them, which would mean, in conditions of inflation, a lowering of the population's living standards. But, proceeding from the demands of normal economic development, it is essential to ensure a tight link between growth of incomes and results of production in all its spheres—state, cooperative, and individual. And the methods for such coordination in the new economic mechanism must be found. The stage of stabilization should also include active moves to create an economy divested of state controls, which has vindicated itself in many countries to a significant extent; to demonopolize production; to form a market infrastructure, and to restructure the structure of the national economy. All of this will promote the startup of competition mechanisms and free price formation, which make up the main content of a market economy.

It is worth singling out the significance of the country's plan and budget for 1991 for the stabilization of the economic situation. Meantime the process of forming a draft plan is causing concern. The industry as a whole, by the beginning of October, only 35 percent of agreements has been concluded, as against 70 percent last year. With the adoption of the president's decrees, providing for stabilization of economic ties and a transition to the widespread application of contractual wholesale prices in the economy, obstacles to the conclusion of contracts have been removed. Communists must promote this process in every way, counteracting departmental inefficiency, parochialism, and misconceived group interests with organization, efficiency, and a sense of responsibility to the whole of our society.

The economic situation in the country can be changed for the better only with the stabilization of the sociopolitical situation. An unbiased analysis of the present similarly shows unequivocally that the only possible politics today are politics of civil peace and accord, with the cooperation of all restructuring democratic forces. Impatience and intolerance in politics only exacerbate confrontation in society, which has in any case reached dangerous limits. Party organizations must wage a resolute struggle against destructive, extremist elements and at the same time set up close joint work with those parties and public movements which are genuinely concerned about the present state of affairs and wish to act in the interests of the people.

Comrades! The need to provide the scope for market relations is not dictated by the subjective desires of some people. We are led toward this by the objective course of the development of our past and present, which testifies to the bankruptcy of the system of instruct and command relationships based upon ownership exclusively by the state, which has been mentioned here in his speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Identifying this with socialism has been a most crude theoretical and practical mistake, which has brought about deep deformations not only in the economy but in the whole of sociopolitical life. The course which is being proposed today toward the construction of a market economy therefore reflects, not attempts dictated by the needs of the moment to get out of the crisis that has gripped the country but the result—achieved at some cost—of searching and reflecting over many years, and of the analysis of national and world experience.

Everything convinces us of the fact that, if the economy is not put resolutely onto the market track our country, irrespective, even, of its current difficulties, will be doomed to lagging increasingly behind the industrially developed states and being transformed into the "fringes" of world civilization.

However the transition to the market economy is not infrequently depicted as the rejection of the social gains of socialism and a return to capitalism, to the society of exploitation in which the class of proprietors opposes the poor.

Apparently it needs to be said once again in full voice that the party is not giving up the ideals of socialism, but it understands socialism to mean not equality in poverty, not social dependence, not the tough administrative regulation of economic and all social life: In our understanding socialism is a society in which the goal of social development is the person, in which the transformation of the working people into the masters of production is secured upon the basis of various forms of ownership and economic management; in which there is a strong motivation of highly productive labor; and in which social justice and the social protection of the working people are guaranteed. It is precisely for the construction of such a society that the 28th Congress of the CPSU chose the transition to the market as a means.

Undoubtedly the market requires the economy to be taken outside the ownership and control of the state to a considerable degree. One of the main forms of removal from state ownership are the joint-stock companies, in which a considerable part of the shares belongs to the working people.

For obvious reasons, this will mainly affect the large enterprises. Many medium-sized and small enterprises could be bought out by their own working collectives and

turned into collective property. Cooperative ownership and public organizations' ownership will receive further development. And last, citizens' private ownership of the means of production is being allowed to a certain extent.

Transition to the new economic relations should be implemented not by force but on the basis of a free choice. Proliferation of one or the other form of property should be determined by its expedience and effectiveness in a given branch or sphere of industry.

The political line toward development of market relations in the agrarian sphere should probably lie in the radical restructure of production relations in the countryside on the basis of land, ownership, and the lease system. And we are not talking here about rejecting large-scale social production or the dismantling of collective and state firms by directive, as some hotheads call for and as many country toilers reasonably fear.

We should create equal economic conditions for kolkhozes, sovkhozes, peasant and individual farms, their cooperatives and associations. It should be specifically stressed that those enormously different social, economic, historical, psychological, and cultural conditions in which peasants of the different republics are working demand a strictly differentiated, regionally based approach toward organization of agricultural production. The sooner and wider the land reform spreads, the more effective will be the development of the market economy in the countryside. In a number of republics the adoption of land legislation has patently been dragged out, and the compilation of an inventory of land reserves, the surveying of land areas, and their handing over to the local soviets, as stipulated in the Law on Land, have not been carried out.

Party committees and communists who work in the soviets of the peoples' deputies should be more active in removing all the obstacles which delay establishment of family farms and peasant farms, in providing all citizens whonso wish with vegetable and fruit growing plots, and in developing farmstead plot farming. The question of introducing the institution of private landownership demands a thorough discussion. The possible negative social and economic implications of the privatization of landownership are evident.

These are speculation in land, interethnic enmity and such stuff. All of this is too serious. The proposal to give the people themselves, everyone, an opportunity to resolve this issue therefore merits full support.

A most complex problem is what to do with the enterprises which make a loss under the plan. If subsidies are fully and immediately discontinued or reduced, the result will be the mass bankruptcy of enterprises and unemployment. The problem does not only lie in removing these shackles from the budget, but in placing all enterprises, including loss-making ones, all collective and state farms, under market conditions, conditions of competition. In the initial period some sort of aid has to be extended to them, but on different terms, through special stabilization funds, temporary financial aid in the form of subsidies, advantageous loans, and underwriting credits from commercial banks. Enterprises will have to be reorganized, and where necessary, management strengthened, manpower cut, certain assets sold off, production redesignated, and so on.

Certainly, there will also exist—and this has to be said out loud—such enterprises which by virtue of the specifics of their production will have to continue to be subsidized from the state budget. Not that there are that many of them, but nevertheless, in all countries there are enterprises, and even entire sectors, which are supported by the state, because bringing them up to the level of the profitable ones generates a chain reaction of prices rises and, eventually, does not yield anything.

In assessing the economic and, still more, the social prospects and possibilities of the market, it is important not to succumb to euphoria, but soberly and fully to evaluate its consequences. It is essential to thoroughly consider in the most careful manner and to forecast all of the economic, social, and political consequences, to reduce to a minimum the losses which are inevitable for any transitional period, and to take account of the peculiarities in the development of each region, republic, and of society as a whole.

Account must primarily be taken of the possibility of a reduction in the volume of production during the initial period of the transition to a market economy. Within certain limits such consequences are inevitable. The production of output not in demand will cease, and readjustment to the production of items needed by society will be required. A reduction in production could occur to a greater extent in the sectors of group "a" and in industrial construction.

Everything must be done to prevent a sharp drop in production. Preference ought to be given to those decisions which entail the least economic losses and social costs. And the most important thing is that this work should have already been started today.

There is a danger that enterprises which have received broad opportunities for earning resources and for spending them as they see fit, will turn them to current needs and, first of all, to salaries and consumptions.

As a matter of fact, that is happening already now in a number of instances and this is aggravating the imbalance, is holding back the growth of accumulations, the reconstruction of production, scientific and technical progress. A sensible investment, financial and taxation policy ought to counterbalance this.

At the first stage of the transition to the market, maximum attention must be given to creating a developed market infrastructure, to training highly skilled specialists possessing the knowledge, ability, and experience of management in the conditions of market relations.

It is important to bear in mind the psychological factor. Long suppression of the individual activity of the person has led to the formation of a considerable group of people who are psychologically unprepared for the strict system of behavior in the conditions of the market economy, for giving the utmost of themselves. A most important task of party organizations is to remove by way of prevention these difficulties which have accumulated in society.

Comrades! The most important thing for the CPSU, the most fundamental question is the question of the social price of the transition to the market economy.

The Central Committee shares the Soviet people's worry about the way the transition to the market will tell on their wellbeing and way of life, and whether or not various strata of the population will pay for this transition with a decline in their living standards.

A market economy is not a goal in itself, but a means to improve the people's life and to solve the acute social problems that have accumulated. For us, communists, this should be the main criterion for evaluating any projects related to the transition to the market. The party does not accept and will fight attempts that chop away at social programs for raising the population's standard of living and encroachment on the vital interests of working people.

The market may give reliable and equal opportunities for raising welfare through an individual labor contribution and it stimulates initiative and entrepreneurism. At the same time, the interests of people should be protected by a state system of social protection which, in many respects, should be created from scratch. We must determine our approaches to the implementation of people's right to work. This right is sacred. One cannot fail to see, however, that it will no longer be possible, in the conditions of a market economy, to maintain full employment of the population artificially, by administrative measures. The individual's responsibility for his attitude to work and the value of a work place will increase. The communists, however, cannot take a passive stand when faced with a threat of unemployment. The CPSU comes out in favor of creating a single state system of unemployment prevention, preemptive preparation, retraining and placing workers in jobs, and material provision for those temporarily unemployed.

During the transition to a market economy, exceptional importance is attached to the party's practical deeds for the social protection of those who are no longer able, or not yet able, to work at full capacity: pensioners, invalids, students, families with many children, low-income strata of the population. We must do everything possible to implement concrete measures aimed at assisting these groups of the population, something which should not encourage sponging, however. The transition to the market should not result in encroachment upon such most important social rights of Soviet people as the rights to education, health care, rest, housing, material maintenance in old age, and during illness etc.

In the conditions of a market economy, approaches to finding solutions to these problems undergo certain changes, but guarantees for implementing the above rights should be not only preserved but enhanced, too. During the transition to the market we see our immediate duty also in counteracting an overall commercialization of culture and of the whole spiritual life. Therefore, communists should take the most active part in developing and implementing a policy of state support for, and financing of, culture, health care and education.

Measures for the social protection of peasants have their own special features. They rightly raise the question of their inequality next to city dwellers. Indeed, the village lags significantly behind the city right across the range of daily and social conditions of life. Undoubtedly, under conditions of a market economy, such special programs as housing and road construction, the provision of gas, electricity, and water supply, health care and education should be implemented with the most vigorous support of the state.

The issue of retail prices is causing the most anxiety among the population. How will retail prices change during the transition to a market economy? On which groups of goods will they be raised and by how much? Will measures be taken to protect, especially those who are less well-off, against inflation?

Honest answers must be given to all these questions. It is clear that the average level of retail prices will increase during the transition to a market. Incidentally, we have not yet arrived at a market and yet prices for many goods have gone up sharply.

It is also clear that state price regulation measures are needed today, especially in the area of necessities, as well as other measures to protect, first and foremost, the less well-off groups of the population against inflation.

We believe that the plenum's participants will speak out on this fundamental issue and submit specific proposals.

It is natural for the CPSU to presume that the involvement of broad sections of the working people in active economic life, in management of the economy, and their transformation into owners and into committed workers should be the ultimate goal of the development of market relations. This alone is the basis, foundation, and guarantee of society's progress within the framework of the socialist choice.

Some say that the transition to the market benefits only dealers in the "shadow economy." It is claimed in this connection that the party, in defending the "market philosophy," is supposedly losing its political face. One cannot agree with this. Communists have been and remain opposed to narrow-mindedness and self-seeking, and to replacing a healthy market with a profiteering bazaar.

We feel that a legal state starts with the assertion of law and order in the economy. The party, all communists should consolidate and conduct the most resolute struggle against any attempts at legalizing the black market, or underground businesses, against plunderers and scroungers making off with their plunder under the new forms of economic management.

Comrades! The transition to the market poses questions of the inter-relations between republics within the framework of the Union in a new way. If one looks honestly into the face of reality, one has to acknowledge that today there is no Union either in its old or new form. There is no reason to regret a state structure, in essence of a unitary formation, which has outlived itself. It is necessary to advance to create a new federation of sovereign states, as laid down in the decisions of the 28th Congress of the party. It is necessary to lend a visible outline to the new internal Union relationships in which the center serves as the necessary condition for the interaction of voluntarily united republics.

The formation of an economic Union of republics, a united economic territory for the broad development of mutually-beneficial market relations should be an important step on the path toward a new Union treaty. The force which economically binds the Union together in market conditions, is not the administrative might of the state, but the economic power of the main subject of the market, the enterprise as the sovereign producer of goods which, more firmly than any administrative fetters, is linked with the other components of the national economy by living threads of economic interests. And precisely such economic ties may serve as the reliable foundation of a Union of sovereign republics. The market, as the economic basis of a qualitatively new Union will make it possible to put an end to the monopolistic diktat of the central bodies, and to gradually correct the distortions of the irrational republican division of labor. Like nothing else, the processes of integration at the level of enterprises and organizations will effectively facilitate the emergence and strengthening of mutually beneficial relations on the basis of equal rights, and free of suspicion, between the republics and territories.

I will not dwell in detail on the political consequences of the possible elimination, in essence, of all Union-wide structures, which may occur as a result of the implementation of the so-called 'horizontal model' of the talks process between republics, which excludes the center from participating and influencing it. It is clear that the implementation of such a model will signify the end of the USSR as a sovereign state and a subject of international law, with all the consequences which flow from this, not only for the Union, but also for every subject of the federation separately.

Here I would like to mention the economic role of the center, as it is seen by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. A single economic expanse presupposes, naturally, the existence of a common monetary system, the organization of a single customs service for the protection of the all-Union market, and the coordination of prices for key types of raw-materials and other goods. Without an economic center it is impossible to talk of the creation of economic conditions for maintaining a defense capability and ensuring the state security of the Union, of the formation of federal funds for the development of a raw-materials base, and for implementing a single scientific-technical and ecological policy in the interests of all members of the economic union. And this is far from everything. I will mention further only the need to form and to use an all-Union currency fund and to fulfil the obligations of the USSR to the international community. A single market is altogether impossible without the centralized formation of a strategy for external economic policy.

Unfortunately, illusions have made their appearance of late with regard to the fact that every republic—and not just every republic—can easily put right its economic position by taking its output onto the external market. You know, we already have rayons which have declared their own airspace, there are population centers on the coast which have declared an economic zone to be their own, and so on. All of this, Comrades, is a dangerous delusion, it is simply dangerous. The international market is a subtle thing, and moving onto it without knowing the state of the market inevitably means dooming oneself to great losses, which, moreover, is confirmed already by many instances.

Painstaking, very hard and at the same time delicate work in establishing new economic relations in the Union lies ahead. One cannot count upon the market automatically settling interethnic relations. But we are confident that it will certainly be conducive to an expansion of ties between peoples, and will thereby help people to recognize the whole absurdity of a policy of nationalist ambitions, economic self-isolation, and separatism.

The view which is pretty widely prevalent, that supposedly this or that republic will get out of the crisis more successfully the further it distances itself from the Union is a profound delusion which leads to impasse, and which can cost our peoples very dear.

Comrades! We can stabilize the situation in the country in the shortest possible time and transfer to the market with the smallest social costs if our party does not lose the initiative in perestroyka; if it is able to direct into the necessary channel those public processes which are getting out of control today.

The discussion at our plenum, and the decisions which it will adopt are intended to help communists restructure their work in the conditions of a transfer to the market on principally new bases, bases new to present generations of party members.

We all have to disperse in a significant number of people, first and foremost among communists, numerous prejudices, fears and misgivings caused by the prospect of a transfer to the market.

We communists must explain for ourselves and help others to understand on what foundations we are restructuring our public building and according to what style we intend to live in it. We are talking about the formation of new economic thinking, about a real revolution in public consciousness. Correspondingly, there is a need to urgently change the entire system of party education and self-education and research work in the party; the work of ideological establishments and the mass news media; to orientate party organizations to a broad retraining of cadres for work in the conditions of a market economy.

Fundamental changes must take place not, only in ideological and propagandist work in our party. It is essential for us to possess, virtually anew, the art of work in local soviets, trade unions, labor collectives—in conditions of a multi-party situation that is really taking shape.

Having come out as an initiator for giving real power to state bodies, we are obliged to give them support, to work in close cooperation with soviets, the government and other executive bodies. Every party committee, acting in concrete conditions, is moreover free in the choice of forms of partnership, dialogue, and cooperation.

It is important to make broad use of the right to put forward new laws, and to be active opponents as a constructive opposition where necessary.

Party groups or factions of communists within the soviets of people's deputies can make a big contribution to this constructive work. Where these groups were set up in good time, they have gained a firm foothold, effectively influencing the work of the soviets and the decisions adopted by the soviets. Without turning the work of setting up such groups into yet another campaign, they must, nevertheless, be seen as one of the central tasks of the day in ensuring the position of the CPSU as the vanguard force in society and the ruling party. There arises a need to set up a reserve cadre of communists capable of engaging in parliamentary activities, of conducting polemics and dialogue with various social and political forces in multiparty conditions.

The face of the economic reform and of all other social changes will, to a large extent, be decided within work forces which remain the basic link of the economy, the guarantor of its stabilization and renewal. Discussions on the issue of depoliticizing work forces and on taking party committees out of enterprises have of late been initiated in every possible way. Unfortunately, in a number of places these discussions have turned into hasty actions which hinder the work of party committees. Supporters of the so-called depoliticization claim that recognition of the multiparty system allegedly demands that there are no parties at all at the enterprises, for otherwise, it is said, they will stand in the administration's way to manage. The hypocrisy of such claims apart, one can state that a varied gamut of views certainly represents no impediment to anyone. On the contrary, the administration and the work force alike will be able to extract from the multitude the best programs, ideas, and proposals. Elementary common sense suggests that in the interests of perestroyka proceeding further one must not destroy a structure like the primary party organization which has gained such a firm foothold within work forces but, on the contrary, one must make the fullest use of its potential.

Indeed, more than 100,000 primary party organizations currently function at industrial, transport, communications, and construction enterprises and more than 40,000 function in agriculture. They stand at the sources of people's economic interests and are at the center of the processes of the formation of the new economic relations. Mass support must be sought here for all undertakings which lead to effective work, and enterprise must be developed.

The great rights with which the new CPSU Rules have invested primary organizations are designed for the complete independence of each of them in their political actions, for the priority of initiative. The improvement of relations between party organizations and the economic leadership is promoted by the exclusion from the CPSU Rules of the right of control of the administration. Party organizations should proceed from the premise that they are not responsibility for decisions made without consulting them, that they have the right to criticize these decisions, to demand their annulment, to put forward alternative proposals. Moreover, to defend the interests of the working people they are obliged to act in the role of opposition to bodies of state power and administration if the rights of man and socialist legality are violated, if the collective is encroached upon, and if people's conditions of work, of everyday life, or all the rest worsen.

The CPSU does not lay claim to a monopoly in carrying out the new economic policy. Thr only important thing here is to not to permit political confrontation, and antagonism, and destructive actions. And therefore, we are for cooperation with the trade unions, with parties, with forces and movements which favor the creation of an effective economy whihc is turned toward man and his needs, the formation of a civilian society and a law-governed state.

We justly criticize the moods of dependence which many party organizations in the localities are not able to rid themselves of at all. However, that in no way signifies an amnesty for shortcomings, or even more so, the curtailment of the staff work carried out by the CPSU Central Committee. On the contrary, that work should be intensified.

In replying to demands persistently being made from below, we have to determine at the current plenum the points of departure for moving along the road of transforming the Central Committee, of converting it from a

command organ of administrative and economic management into a center of political and organizational work, the collective thought of the party, and scientifically accurate forecasting.

The materials distributed to participants in the plenum contain a proposal on organizing the work of the commissions of the CPSU Central Committee and of the Central Committee apparatus. Similar questions are currently being studied and addressed by party committees. This is a very crucial factor. An important, integral part of the party structure is being created, which is called upon to unite the elected party organs in concerted work with communists, to regenerate an atmosphere of comradeship in the party milieu, and to ensure the priority of the social principle in party work. At the same time, the size of the party apparatus is being sharply reduced, and the level of its remit is rising. Over half of the party's renewed cadres potential will consist of elected officials. This is important to stress, bearing in mind the attacks on, and even outright persecution of party officials. Reflecting the will of communists, we want to state that the party will firmly defend all of its members, and also party officials, using the full force of Soviet laws.

The party is also concerned by the state of party organizations, since serious tasks cannot be resolved with feeble strength. In the recent period departures from the party have become more frequent. In the first half of 1990, 371,000 people left the ranks of the CPSU, and in the period July-August alone—311,000.

This is the result, so to speak, of people's political self-determination at a sharp turning point. It is clearly a healthy process of self-cleansing that is, overall, taking place in the party. It is being left by socially passive, casual people. But there is another type—the hypocrite. Seeing that membership of the party at the present time does not promise any benefits, while leaving the party is not dangerous, they are hurriedly retreating from the CPSU, gathering political capital by running down its history and ideals.

Unfortunately, communists who have gone to pieces in these complex conditions or who have not been given their fair share of attention are not infrequently encountered among those who have handed back their party cards. Much, therefore, also depends upon the party organizations if people who are worthy in every respect are not to leave our ranks and if those who have left the CPSU are not to join the ranks of the anticommunists, as we often see happening now. Incidentally, applications to return to the CPSU are already being received from people who have left its ranks in haste because of the way they felt. I think that this is one of the important social symptoms and the door must be open for such people.

But the main thing which sustains our optimism is the desire of nonparty people, primarily from among the young, to join the party now, and the readiness of active champions of perestroyka to share the difficulties of this crucial period with us. I am sure that they will always take pride in that act, which today demands great civic courage, just as the members of the CPSU who became communists during 1941-1943 take pride in what they did.

No matter how hard one tries it is impossible to list all the problems of party work. The main thing I would like to stress is that one must look at everything creatively, in a new way, and act in the spirit of the times, without giving in to despondency and without giving up in the face of difficulties. The present situation in the CPSU is not, strictly speaking, unique. Similar situations have already occurred at sharp turning points in history and communists have emerged from the trials with honor.

Today, on behalf of the Central Committee, we say to our comrades in the party from this platform: Hold your heads up high, you have put up with endless brazen insults for long enough. Multiplying by many times our efforts to resolve the problems that disturb society can alone be the best reply to slander, provocation, and political pressure.

Accounts of the speeches by the plenum participants will be published.

## Further on Hijacking to Finland

### Hijacker Profiled

*LD0510204790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1645 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Excerpts] Moscow, 5 Oct (TASS)—Another Soviet airliner on a domestic flight was hijacked to Finland this morning. [passage omitted]

It has become known that the hijacker was a certain N.I. Selivanov, born in 1949, an inhabitant of Lipetsk Oblast. He threatened to blow up the plane if his demands were not met. And although the Novgorod examination service vouched that there could not be an explosive device in the air, the crew made the decision to land at Helsinki. To all appearances, such an outcome suited the hijacker also.

Selivanov, who according to unconfirmed data is mentally ill, is now in the Finnish capital while the plane and passengers have returned home.

The Soviet Yak-40 airliner, which was on the Novgorod-Leningrad-Petrozavodsk route and was hijacked to Finland by a criminal, left Helsinki for home with 20 passengers on board at 1907 local time today.

The criminal, N.I. Selivanov has been detained by the Finnish police and an investigation has been initiated against him. He is accused of hijacking the passenger plane.

### Hijacker Held in Finland

*LD0610223790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The Central Criminal Police of Finland decided today to take into custody Soviet citizen Nikolay Ivanovich Selivanov, who hijacked a Soviet plane on the Novgorod-Petrozavodsk route on 5 October. [passage omitted]

It has been established that Selivanov had recently been working as a concrete layer, and shortly before that as a driver. A few years ago he was in a sanatorium for those with nervous disorders.

### Moscow Rally Supports Alternative Service

*LD0710153190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1456 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[Text] Moscow, 7 Oct (TASS)—A rally took place today at the USSR Ministry of Defense building on Arbat Square in Moscow supporting the immediate adoption of specific legislative measures aimed at introducing an alternative service in the USSR. The rally organizers included the "Memorial" society, the committee of soldiers' mothers, and several political youth organizations.

The speakers drew attention to the crisis in the call-up system, and called for its humanization, for radical military reforms, and for bringing the appropriate legislation into line with basic human rights.

### Council of Ministers Presidium Discusses Crime

*LD0510190190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1632 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] Moscow, 5 Oct (TASS)—There can be no defeating the crime rate in the country today without consolidating the law and order bodies and coordinating their activities. This is the opinion reached by the participants in a session of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium held in Moscow on Thursday. It examined the work of the law and order bodies in combating crime and the measures being taken to ensure legality and law and order in society.

Vadim Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs, and Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the KGB, gave reports. The Minister of Internal Affairs noted that crime is taking on ever greater proportions and remains one of the major factors of social tension. He drew attention to the fact that the overall number of crimes committed over a period of eight months has grown by 13.1 percent, and the number of serious crimes by 19.7 percent.

The greatest increases are in Armenia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and the Russian Federation.

It was the common opinion that what is essential are a united front and united approach to organizing the fight against crime, precise regulation of powers in relations between the center and the republics, and the adoption of an all-Union crime-fighting program.

Combating organized crime as a symbiosis of the criminal world, the shadow economy, corruption, and an active incursion into the area of the security of state and society, is, stressed the KGB chairman, a political problem.

The following figures were given: In a mere 18 months, KGB bodies have uncovered more than 1,200 organized criminal groups. During the course of their operations, valuables and money worth a total of 214 million rubles were removed from criminal circulation.

In the view of the KGB chairman, the fight against organized crime should be enshrined in legislation as one of the functions of the bodies of state security, a special body should be set up at the Council of Ministers or under the Soviet president to coordinate and cooperate in the work of the law and order bodies, and such normative acts as the bases of criminal legislation and laws on the Soviet militia, crimes against the state, and others should be adopted.

Dmitriy Yazov, member of the Presidential Council and USSR minister of defense, said the main concern of Soviet people "is not empty shops but the destruction of the system that governs the state. We are counting the numbers of crimes throughout the country and in the republics today, tomorrow there might be no one to analyze these figures. The illegal laws adopted in the Baltic, Transcaucasus, Moldova, and Ukraine are completely undermining the foundations not only of the law and order bodies but also of the army." Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, spoke in conclusion.

### Ryzhkov Interviewed on Plans To Combat Crime

*LD0510213190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1845 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Interview with Premier N.I. Ryzhkov by correspondent Vadim Lobachenko; place and date not given; from the "In the Government" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Lobachenko] Nikolay Ivanovich, there are reports in today's papers on yesterday's meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers. As we understand it, it was devoted to the most dangerous shortage of all—the shortage of legality and law and order in the country, and to how the rise in crime should be combatted. We all know what an acute problem this is, but we are perhaps unaware of the full seriousness of it.

[Ryzhkov] The crime situation in the country is causing very serious concern and requires the adoption of immediate measures—immediate and resolute measures. I

shall quote just a few figures to illustrate the true seriousness of the problem. Judge for yourselves: In 1989 there was a sharp upturn in crime, with an overall rise of 33 percent in the number of crimes, including a 41 percent rise in severe crime.

The law enforcement bodies have naturally taken certain measures to restore order to some extent, but the figures show in the first eight months of this year alone the total number of crimes, at more than 1.7 million, was up another 13 percent over the same period last year, while serious crime increased by 20 percent. Over the same period 16,400 people were killed and more than 4,600 crimes were committed with the use of arms.

People are writing to us in the Council of Ministers in great concern to ask what is happening to the country. Is it a paralysis of power or a paralysis of the law enforcement bodies? It is true that people cannot go out into the streets calmly, nor can they travel on public transportation. Profiteering is booming, the shadow economy is booming, and this is affecting people's lives directly.

For this reason, the Council of Ministers specially raised the issue for discussion, and at yesterday's meeting of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers we heard a report from Internal Affairs Minister Comrade Bakatin and Chairman of the State Security Committee Comrade Kryuchkov. They reported on the crime situation and on the measures being planned. I can tell you that it was a very tough discussion, a very principled one, since—once more I repeat—the situation is very disturbing and, I think, even a critical state of affairs.

[Lobachenko] The criminals have simply become brazen.

[Ryzhkov] Yes, the criminals have simply become brazen, and we have therefore drawn the appropriate conclusions and made the assessment that neither the Interior Ministry nor the KGB are fully performing the functions entrusted to them in this respect. A severe warning was given to Internal Affairs Minister Comrade Bakatin, and it was indicated to the State Security Committee that they are not using all the means they have in that committee.

But the criminals have simply become brazen, because, well, this is due to the fact that they are not being properly repulsed. I expressed by position yesterday at the government meeting—and it was supported by all the government members—that I, as prime minister and as a citizen, can no longer tolerate this, and we shall take the very strictest measures to restore order in the country. People are tired of it all; people are wondering when order will finally be restored. So it simply cannot be tolerated any more and I—this might sound bombastic, I do not know—but we are declaring war on crime. We are declaring simply that we will not put up with it any more.

I do not want... [changes thought] I am not going to dwell on the social roots that foster the criminal environment. They exist. There are some deeper roots; there are some that have grown recently, in the last few years...

[Lobachenko] The crisis in society.

[Ryzhkov] Yes, the crisis in society, the crisis in the economy. This is a breeding ground, of course, and we have to take up these issues, and yesterday the presidium decided that we are drawing up special measures—and we shall confirm them next week—to cut off these roots, as it were. We shall publish this decision in the press and it will form the foundation of our future work. But this is a lengthy process, a relatively lengthy one. So, in parallel with making more severe decisions, so to speak, to resolve severe processes, we must at the same time make decisions to restore order where we know what is to be done.

There are only a few issues I will dwell on. First, street crime. We cannot continue putting up with what is happening in our country. How can someone work in a factory or in an institute if he is wondering what is happening to his family at home? Has his daughter, let us say, arrived home from school? Has his wife returned home safely? All this takes its toll in the end. We must, well, restore order here, so that we are not worried about our families and so that things are normal on the streets. Moreover, we did once have such a situation. We were proud that Soviet people could walk along the street at any time of day or night without being harmed. So surely today we can sort this out.

Some 95 percent of the society is healthy. Surely it can deal with the five percent of the people who are attempting to break Soviet laws. There was a very serious conversation about this yesterday, and we demanded that the militia adopt measures. Of course, the militia must be helped, and we will help with technical means—and evidently matters of pay also need to be tackled—but I am convinced that the militia needs to be helped and, for this reason, I call upon all the people, on all the citizens of our country: The militia must be helped. We must take up our stance alongside the militia today because this is to the good of all our people. We must bring about order ourselves, and we do have experience with this. I appeal to the labor collectives. I appeal to students, to all citizens. Let us go into the streets. Let us help the militia. In that way we will be helping ourselves. Listen, we have wonderful guys, those back from Afghanistan. We should... [changes thought] I appeal to them: Help. You are brave guys. Help us in the end to break this situation of crime in the street.

[Lobachenko] Essentially, it is now a war against crime, after all. We should all contribute as much as we can to that war.

[Ryzhkov] That is right; it is a real war going on. And indeed, who will win the war? Crime has gone on the attack. Are we really going to retreat? Can we, a powerful state, really not cope with this? I am convinced that it is just our dismay at the boldness of the criminals that has resulted in our finding ourselves in such a situation. One

simply cannot read the letters from the working people who write to us or send cables. They do not understand what is going on. Therefore, we must help the militia and then, I am convinced, we shall cope with this. We can cope with this.

[Lobachenko] Nikolay Ivanovich, you know, the security forces in any state are the backbone of law and order. Along these same lines, will our mighty Committee of State Security be playing a more active role?

[Ryzhkov] Last year when we saw that organized crime was beginning to take shape, this was not something we really understood, because there had been elements of organized crime in the country before, although never on such a scale.

[Lobachenko] We knew about it more from literature...

[Ryzhkov, interrupting] That is right. We knew more from books. We read about it in detective stories. But we encountered this phenomenon last year and could see that organized crime centers were starting up, penetrating deep into the economy, state enterprises, and even the management bodies at all levels.

We then asked, or appealed to the State Security Committee too, and said you have very good cadres, qualified cadres, and that whereas it is possible to clean up the streets (?by mass presence) and through the bravery of the guys, here they have to be very qualified people, of course. In turn, the State Security Committee responded to the cause. It set up a structure of its own and in 18 months it has already cleared up 1,200 such criminal groups. Also, at yesterday's presidium meeting it was said that the State Security Committee has the potential to do better in this respect. It has to regroup, even within the committee, and assign more qualified cadres to this area, because as we move closer toward a market I am afraid that this organized crime, which has penetrated deeply into our society's economic life, might cause a very great deal of trouble. So I am convinced that the State Security Committee will cope with this business.

There is one other issue, of course—that of profiteering, profiteering of the most primitive sort. We have known about profiteering for a long time, of course, yet our country has never known profiteering on the scale it has reached today. Our profiteers have become brazen today. Before yesterday's presidium meeting we looked up some figures: 77 of every 100 verified cases of profiteering concern the state retail sector. In other words, three-quarters are in the state retail sector.

If in the past the profiteers were afraid that they would be brought to account, nowadays, as we can see, they are even acting provocatively. So we are going to take the very toughest measures on this. We realize that the laws as they exist today are nothing to the profiteers. They might pay a 10-ruble [R] fine while at the same time pocketing R1,000. These are elements that live off the people.

[Lobachenko] Parasitic.

[Ryzhkov] They are parasites living off the people. After all, someone earns money by the sweat of his brow to provide for his family or so that he can just buy something—he comes and buys from someone who has done nothing.

[Lobachenko] They are simply thieves.

[Ryzhkov] They are thieves brazenly demanding this kind of money from ordinary Soviet people, from workers, without permission from anyone.

Can we put up with this? No, we cannot. Therefore, we must adopt strict laws. The laws in existence today have become obsolete. They were applicable a decade ago. But today, when thousands are being made from speculation—hundreds of thousands of rubles are being earned from speculation—what is it, let us say, to pay R100 fine? Yesterday we adopted a decision and the minister of internal affairs put forward a proposal—a draft law on speculation. We have given instructions to develop it in the course of a week in order to present it to the USSR Supreme Soviet. Incidentally, the Lithuanian comrades, Lithuania, have adopted a law which is not bad at all. They have adopted a very good law and we are even utilizing some of its elements and we hope that the Supreme Soviet, the people's deputies, will study this law quickly because we simply cannot delay this any longer. We need a very strict law that will put everyone in their place.

[Lobachenko] The more so, since we are switching to a market economy, and this difficult interim period may create an additional culture medium for criminal elements.

[Ryzhkov] You know, this alarms us very much. This very fact that, during a transition to a market economy, if we do not have firm, harsh laws to regulate economic relations, we could find ourselves in a very difficult situation. Just look. We earlier adopted decisions and resolutions that were not bad and were designed to provide a stimulus to economic development. Take the question of cooperatives. After all, we adopted a good law. But other laws that would have regulated the life of cooperatives have not been followed through to their conclusion. And it has come about that what was a good trend has today turned out to be in such a state that, indeed, there are very many transgressors there.

And all of this, naturally, gives rise to people's opposition. People no longer accept the cooperatives. Therefore, if we continue to act (in this manner) during the transition to a market economy and we do not manage to set up a legal basis for a viable regulated economy, for a normal life for people, we may find ourselves in an onerous position.

Therefore, everything we talked about yesterday and what we decided on is all directed towards both correcting the situation today and simultaneously setting up a legal basis for tomorrow, as it were.

[Lobachenko] Incidentally, yesterday, was the role of journalists in the fight against crime discussed at the sitting of the Council of Ministers Presidium, and what is your personal attitude to this question?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, there was a very thorough conversation yesterday. We invited correspondents and representatives of our country's central newspapers.

They took part in this great debate. And so a great deal of complaints and at the same time requests were addressed to the media. This is my view. I expressed it yesterday, and now I would like to express it to all the viewers. The press is doing great work, and one can hardly overstate what it has done in the way of glasnost and democratization. All this really is being channelled in a constructive way. But at the same time—and I realize that some people might not agree with me—the press can be a destructive force too. In this instance, when in the last couple of years there has been a reappraisal of many things, I think that somewhere we have disturbed a certain balance. Today we speak of the militia and the KGB. I have in mind the fact that they delivered reports yesterday. But, to speak frankly, why is the procuracy in such a state today? It is possible to reject a person, but one cannot reject a system. You can criticize failures somewhere: They have existed in the past, and evidently will continue to occur in the procuracy and in the courts. But you must not generalize about the whole picture. Look here, the procuracy has also in some measure ended up under a certain amount of public pressure.

The courts have come under some kind of public pressure. I want to say that the KGB, Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the Ministry of Defense have undergone great attacks recently.

Everything should, everything should be very seriously weighed up. Where there are shortcomings, let us criticize them. Nevertheless, the state must have its law-enforcement bodies. Without such bodies no state can function normally. In this respect, I think that many organs of the mass media do not display a careful enough attitude. So, as far as this topic we are discussing today is concerned, I expressed my opinion yesterday, and this is what I would like to say about it today:

Our society is in danger, in danger from crime. When our country, our people, and our citizens have been confronted by danger, we have always mobilized. Very determined mobilizations have taken place. Therefore, I consider that the organs of the mass media, especially today, as it is commonly said, should help the common cause so that we can cope with this disease that has struck our country.

Today, we should forget left and right in this task. Today, we should forget that there are democrats and conservatives. Today, there is only one disaster confronting the country. Therefore, let us unite. This, I think, is the task facing us all.

[Lobachenko] Only together, if we join forces, can we...

[Ryzhkov, interrupting] This is the only way. This is the only way. This is the only way because this is a disaster for both the left and the right, for democrats and conservatives. This is our common trouble. Therefore, let us then fight together against it.

[Lobchenko] Thank you, Nikolay Ivanovich, for the discussion. All the best.

[Ryzhkov] All the best.

## Moscow CPSU Committee Holds Plenum 5 Oct

*LD0510175190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] A plenum of the Moscow City CPSU Committee took place today.

Having discussed a report by Prokovyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Party committee, participants in the plenum noted that crises are building up in the country and in towns. Production discipline is declining and shady dealings, egoism, crime, and speculations are becoming ever more widespread. A collapse of the economy is exacerbating political tension. It was reported at the plenum that this is a result of strategic errors and tactical mistakes made during perestroyka. These are the conditions in which the transition to market relations is being prepared.

Having stressed that this transition has already become a reality, the plenum expressed surprise at the haste with which a transition program was adopted. The CPSU city committee thinks it necessary to hand over a portion of state property to labor collectives free of charge. The transition to the market should be preceded by efficient stabilization of the economy. It is a duty of communists to give practical support to the working people during the development of market relations. Moscow's party organization intends to use actively its representation in soviets for adopting decisions on social protection for low income categories of citizens.

The plenum addressed various political forces with a proposal to adopt coordinated actions to solve moscow's socioeconomic crisis. It expressed hope for the president's resolute actions to stabilize the situation in the interests of perestroyka and implementing economic reform.

Participants in the plenum called on Muscovites to participate in the procession on Red Square on 7 November.

### Action Program-90 Called 'Soap Bubble'

*PM0810102190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 90 p 1*

[I. Sichka article under the "Dialogue: Ask Questions!" rubric: "Will the Author Stand up, Please!"]

[Text] How did the "Action Program-90," which is linked with a plot by democrats, appear and where from? We are asked this question not just by readers but by parliamentarians, too.

For two weeks now there have been skirmishes in the press and at sessions of the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviets about a "democrats' plot." Passions are running high over the Russian Democratic Forum [RDF] and its odious "Action Program-90."

It contains an appeal to begin the partition of state property without prior agreement, create self-defense detachments, and organize acts of civil disobedience. With prompting from TASS, the "Program" was linked with broad circles of the democratic forces and presented as though it were their manifesto.

Before causing a panic, let us ask: Just what is this Russian Democratic Forum and who is behind it?

Yesterday, RDF representatives held a press conference for journalists. And everything immediately began to fall into place. First, it was bluntly stated that the RDF does not express the views of the whole left-wing movement. Furthermore, the bulk of left-wing forces is constantly distancing itself from the RDF. The RDF itself is a quite ephemeral organization, it is not registered anywhere, has no organizational structures, no recorded membership, statutes, program, and so on. That is, at the moment just a few parties and organizations may be joining it, in the future others might do so.

By and large, it is actually a great big soap bubble. And it is quite understandable that so far no one has paid serious attention to it. As for their "Action Program-90," which incidentally is not signed by a single authorized representative of any party or social organization apart from V. Skurlatov himself, there are hundreds of such manifestos, declarations, appeals, and so on and so forth currently going the rounds in Moscow.

But why then did the RDF suddenly rise to the very crest of the political wave with its "Program"? Why did this program, compiled back in midsummer and no secret to anybody, wait until September to suddenly "explode," seizing the minds of journalists and politicians alike?

A partial answer to these questions has come from RDF representatives themselves. Moscow City Soviet Deputy S. Gorbachev stated at the press conference that after being received at the CPSU Central Committee, "Action Program-90" was sent out to local party organs.

It should be borne in mind here that a number of USSR people's deputies, including Yuriy Afanasyev, people who have no connection with the RDF, are now calling for convening a forum of the country's democratic forces. And if this is presented now under the auspices of the eclectic and in many ways really extremist "Action Program-90," the forthcoming democrats' forum could be considered seriously compromised for a long time to come.

Furthermore, as I have learned from reliable sources, several weeks ago, when no one had even heard of the RDF or "Action Program-90," USSR KGB chairman V. Kryuchkov reported on this document to a Politburo session attended by M.S. Gorbachev and made the appropriate comments. A wave spread immediately through the leaders of the law enforcement agencies and the Army. Furthermore, the "Program's" extremist tenor was linked to the name of Afanasyev and other leaders of the real democratic movement, who are backed by truly considerable forces.

But now look at the atmosphere in which all this is taking place. A bloc of real left-center forces, the Gorbachev-Yeltsin alliance, had only just begun to emerge and the president had openly declared his commitment to the Shatalin program... And now the bubble of the RDF and its "Action Program-90" bursts with a bang. Massive pressure begins to be exerted from the right of the political spectrum: "The democrats are plotting! Be vigilant!" Meanwhile, a wave of discontent with the Ryzhkov government is really sweeping the country. In this situation, I fully admit, some precautionary measures may have been taken to mobilize military units to prevent possible disorders. But in the atmosphere of universal suspicion the left wing is already saying with concern: "What are these strange troop movements around Moscow? Is the Right preparing a military coup?!"

That was it. A pitched battle got under way. The president became extremely cautious, confrontation broke out between the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets, and the Shatalin program was not adopted. Everything remained as it was. Yet we were hoping for progress this fall!

Sooner or later it must all be clarified. There is no "democrats' plot" or "right-wing military coup." It is all a soap bubble. But look at the effect that it has had at the level of big-league politics. It only remains to applaud bitterly those who know how to produce these "brilliant" bubbles. It did the trick.

### Economic Implications of 'Breakup' of USSR

*PM0810142290 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 1*

[Stanislav Kondrashov article under the rubric "Political Diary": "Who Needs Us Like This?"]

[Text] Two processes have coincided recently. One is still not over, but is essentially complete. The other is still under way, picking up speed, and its future result is

unclear. These processes are German unification and... the breakup of the Soviet Union. The 45 years since the great and cruel war has seen the former vanquished countries triumph and the former victors become the butt of history, which was long under the thumb of a totalitarian regime and is now having its inevitable say. As the poet said—although in reference to a totally different, intimate situation—"...but the impulse to escape is even stronger, and the desire to break away is tempting." Or as today's wits would put it: Sovereignty is on parade from the republics to the rural soviets.

What united the Germans? Naturally, the sense of being a united nation, but, above all, the strong and reliable West German reputation that is welcomed worldwide, and the obvious life which the East Germans could see in West Germany. What divides us? A bad, poor, degrading, and also obvious life, and a ruble which has deteriorated so rapidly during our economically ill-considered perestroyka that it has been dubbed a Mickey Mouse currency. Having failed to find the good life together, we now want to seek it separately. We busy ourselves looking for sundry concepts to bring happiness not only to ourselves but to the entire world. And now we have found another: the more sovereignty the better. And we do not want to touch the poor ruble with a barge pole—we increasingly prefer freely convertible currency in our country. But the people in the West who have this convertible currency look at us in confusion and even alarm, wondering where we are all racing to. And they can see without sentiment or rose-colored glasses that we are racing toward chaos.

At a reception Wednesday at the West German Embassy—which is now the German Embassy—I asked the counselor for economic affairs how our parade of sovereignties would affect them and their economic relations with the Soviet Union. Ruinously—that was the gist of his reply. We need to accelerate the elaboration of a union treaty, he counseled, and divide up powers between the center and the union republics. The business world cannot do business if it does not know with whom it is doing business. People will increasingly lose confidence and interest if our state of chaos continues. Then they will turn their backs on us: Who is going to spend their capital on chaos? Who is going to love us for our nice eyes alone—that is, for showing how we have suddenly become democratic?

Germany, East and West, was our largest partner to the west of Soviet borders. And, now it is united, it remains our largest partner. If only out of a sense of gratitude that the Soviet Union, under its current leadership, has allowed it to unite. It was not without our assistance that Chancellor Kohl has become a historic figure—the chancellor who united Germany. Out of a sense of gratitude he has even undertaken to build and pay for apartments for the Soviet servicemen who are to leave Germany by late 1994. All the more so because the Soviet troops will leave more easily, willingly, and perhaps quickly if they are well provided for with accommodation in the fatherland. But a sense of gratitude does not last forever and cannot be the basis of interstate economic relations. More important and longer-lasting is the material interest of German big business, and it, once again, cannot develop in an atmosphere of disorder and chaos. Only small fish can be caught in muddy waters.

Moscow has established contact with the IMF and is thinking about joining it. The IMF looks favorably on Moscow and is even sending its highly experienced experts to look into the Soviet economy and give their recommendations. This may go against the grain for us, but it will be useful. Adding to this the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, THE WASHINGTON POST wrote that "in principle the United States and the other main states have no objection to Soviet participation in these organizations." There is a hitch, however: "Initially Moscow will have to prove that the USSR will not break up into many parts." In the eyes of U.S. big business the very concept of the Soviet Union is being multiplied, and not because the businessmen are intoxicated, but because they are more sober in their evaluation of us than we are. Here is another quotation, from the influential BUSINESS WEEK: "The increasing conflict between the Soviet republics and the central government in Moscow is hampering the success of Moscow's desire to become a full participant in the global economy. What partners are we dealing with?"

This is a question that has often been heard by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister E.Ye. Obminskiy, who handles foreign economic affairs. He told me that he had been asked it by ambassadors accredited to Moscow. Their countries want to deal with a reliable partner. The deputy minister heard something from the ambassadors that he was well aware of already: Foreign capital needs a strong state which is not going to suddenly disappear tomorrow—as it did, you will remember, in November 1917, when it repudiated its foreign debts and various commitments to foreign capitalists. Only a stable and strong state can guarantee the safety and profitability of investments. Moreover, those foreign businessmen who would like to set up joint ventures with our businessmen need an all-union market to sell their output rather than a succession of separate republics bristling with customs barriers against each other. They do not want to run up against these barriers when selling their products, especially as other places and the other common market have pretty much gotten rid of them.

This, as Obminskiy puts it, is a "pernicious economic enthusiasm for separation." I would add that it is an enthusiasm known to us all: getting "right down to basics, and then..." In Russian this is called getting carried away...

Yet the debating statesmen from Gorbachev and Yeltsin to politicians and parliamentarians need to take a good look at themselves and ponder the situation. They must place their responsibility to the people above everything. Some structures have already been made impotent and look doomed. Others are at the groundwork stage, with

only dust visible in place of what has been destroyed. Of course, there is no going back to the former empire or the former totalitarian supercentralization. But even during dismantling work brains are more important than sledgehammers. After all, this is all being done for people, not just to prove who is right. The country and the people are desperate. They need provisions, medicine, and the most basic consumer goods. Apart from anything else they need urgent foreign aid. The faster and more faithful we are in reaching agreement among ourselves and in postponing secondary points for the sake of the urgent main points, the faster and more extensively that aid will be forthcoming.

## Gorbachev Meets With Cultural Leaders 29 Sep

*PM0410110590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Oct 90 Second Edition pp 1-4*

[TASS report: "Time of Joint Action. M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With Soviet Cultural Figures"]

[Text] As already reported, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev met with Soviet cultural figures in the Kremlin 29 September.

You clearly have much to say, the president said, addressing the audience. There have been appeals and letters. On the eve of the USSR Supreme Soviet session, the culture minister delivered a memorandum. This was a signal to the Supreme Soviet and the leadership: There are problems on which consultations must be held. No matter how difficult things are in the country, whatever has happened to us, culture is the focal point around which nations, the people, and especially the peoples have always united.

This was clear from the very beginning of perestroyka. When we began improving people's lives and "humanizing" society, we understood that this task could not be resolved without our intelligentsia or its support. To be frank, nothing would have happened at all had it not been for the position of the intelligentsia, as I have already had occasion to say.

But now you are issuing alarm signals, so there must be a most thorough examination of what is happening. Society has reached its present stage through many trials, errors, and deformations—both in the past and in the period of perestroyka. We have entered a phase of profound, fundamental change in all spheres of life and we must do everything to ensure that we rid ourselves of those deformations and deepen the process of improving our multinational Union state by relying on the positive things created in those years.

This is perhaps the hardest task because we are talking about a delicate and sensitive matter. It will take enormous composure, mutual understanding, and joint actions. We are on the verge of entering the market and that means a new life style, a new economy, and new relations and institutions.

Last year, on the 90th birthday of Leonid Maksimovich Leonov, I went to visit him. I was struck by the fact that he keeps abreast of all the details of the mosaic of our perestroyka. The greatest difficulty, he noted then, is that we are trying to achieve a breakthrough which will determine what the country will be like in 100 or perhaps 200 years. I said to him: Yes, this is a great cause, but it will also be difficult and dramatic. Such things are never easy, but as in fairy tales I hope that our plans have a happy ending.

We are working in a difficult situation: Society is overburdened with problems, ailments, and afflictions. And it is very important to give people correct guidance, otherwise they will not accept the goals that are set. In view of this we simply had to meet and talk now. First I want to hear what you have to say: what you are thinking, what you see, what your observations are. There should be no surprise that we sometimes react differently to particular questions. The artist's understanding and feelings are often different from the politician's; he has different associations, a different reaction. And sometimes there are eruptions of emotions which shock bystanders who do not have such a fertile imagination. Although policy without imagination is no policy. In short, I would like you to share your ideas and express your wishes if you want—I will welcome that. Just as it is impossible to enter the market without stabilizing the political, legal, and economic situation, so we can hardly expect to be able to avoid losses unless we consolidate society. That is the most important thing. Despite the whole drama and even tragedy of these years, we have nevertheless managed to avoid the worst and preserve a peaceful path of development. We must reject the extremists and the "madmen," whatever view they represent. In some places elements have appeared that are quite simply quasifascist, but the bulk of our society, whichever way people lean—to the center or the right or left wing—these are our people, our present society and the existing differences of views must be perceived as its natural state.

Then there was a lively and interested exchange of opinions.

### Speech by D.S. Likhachev

I want first to express my attitude toward perestroyka. We are living through a great era but are not sufficiently aware of this. This era contains things that will last for thousands of years. They are first and foremost the favorable changes in international politics, which affect the whole world. Second, there is the liberation of culture, which is of enormous significance for us. But when a bird is released from a cage it meets two difficulties. First, its little wings are weak, I know that from experience: I like birds very much and have kept them. And second—it has nothing to eat although it was used to receiving food in the cage. That is what is happening in our country now. We have released the bird of culture from its cage, but there are problems in our country with food and the bird has feeble wings. The fact

that we have released this bird is of the most colossal significance not for the present day, it is true, but for the centuries and millennia to come.

I do not like making long speeches so I have prepared for my speech theses which I have set out in the form of a declaration on the protection of cultural rights. We also need a brief preface which I have not written yet.

First: What I have in mind is to protect the rights of all types of culture. We have not forgotten that there are very many types of culture. The culture of labor, the culture of administrative leadership, the culture of librarianship, archive work, and museum management, the protection of scientific workers and art—in all its forms, cultural objects, cultural monuments, and so forth. The culture of the individual and the culture of human contact; on the level of humanizing our society in conditions of today's perestroyka. It even seems to me that I am preparing a declaration on the international protection of culture but this document is of the greatest importance for our perestroyka.

Second: The declaration proposes giving priority to culture in our society. Because otherwise it is impossible to fulfill all the laws and resolutions, carry out all types of human activity, and overcome all the shortcomings in the economic and social sphere. This is extremely important!

We have a vulgarized understanding of the materialist tenet that "being determines consciousness." It has done us great harm because it applies only to the philosophical bases of being and consciousness. In specific social conditions it is consciousness, that is culture and spirit, which determines being. Life is the embodiment of the ideas and concepts which have now been presented to us in the process of perestroyka. Not vice versa. Therefore, our consciousness, like this meeting, for example, directs society, it is not a being that directs us.

Third: The declaration acknowledges that culture, as the most vulnerable part of reality, must be protected by a special law. This applies primarily to the tax system, which must provide for the interests of cultural activity. I want to draw attention to the fact that we are the only country in the world that does not have days when you can visit museums for free. The Hermitage takes two rubles [R] from visitors every day whereas under the tsars entry was free. There must be one day a week when entrance to the Hermitage is free to children and adolescents if we want their culture to develop. No one who has the money will take advantage of this free day. But this is necessary for the dissemination of culture. And not only at the Hermitage but in every museum in the country—the Russian Museum, the Tretyakov Gallery....

Meanwhile, all my attempts to achieve this have met with harsh objections because it will reduce revenue. But children and culture should not be a source of revenue.

Fourth: The declaration notes that all major enterprises and industrial associations, like the "Kirovskiy Zavod" or the "Gorkovskiy Avtozavod," for example, and tourist organizations which themselves depend on culture and the environment—and you will have noticed that I placed the culture of labor first—should subsidize specific cultural enterprises, schools, creches, kindergartens, higher educational establishments, technical colleges, lecture halls, museums, theaters, concert associations, and so forth. Money must be taken from those large enterprises which do not know what to do with their money and offer it to our fund. They are morally obliged to do this and to take part to the best of their ability in the protection of cultural monuments.

The fact is that Mamontov, Morozov, Tretyakov, Bakhrushev, Shchukin, and the others were able to subsidize cultural ventures. But there are no worker-peasant millionaire enterprises subsidizing culture today. We must find our own Mamontovs and Shchukins in the form of these large enterprises.

Fifth: The declaration acknowledges that national assets, museum artifacts, books, all documents, and archive materials are the property of all the people. This is very important. And they may not be sold, redistributed, or exported for long periods with the concomitant danger to their condition as now happens. The Hermitage has been sending some of its best works abroad for a number of years now and is closing its golden treasury. Some 300 works are being sent to the United States where they will tour various cities, where there is a danger of theft, then they will go to Japan. This is impossible. Therefore, what is called the property of all the people must receive the highest government authorization in our country before being exhibited abroad.

At the Pushkin House where I work they concluded a contract with submarine workers giving them priority in the use of the manuscripts of Pushkin, Dostoyevskiy, Saltykov-Shchedrin, and all the Pushkin House's assets. This was a contract with people who did not even understand what they had taken on board. They said that they would take good care of Pushkin's literary works. But they are not just literary works! They are manuscripts! And the Academy of Sciences gives its permission to this.

I protested and the matter was stopped. Gidaspov helped me in this regard.

Now for the sale of duplicates. The Lenin Library and the Academy of Sciences Library are currently selling duplicates of the most valuable books to the West and to antiquarian booksellers. The reason for this is that we have several copies of particular books. But the libraries in Minsk and Kiev have been absolutely ransacked and thousands of libraries need duplicates. Therefore, before selling them to the West we should find out what our own country needs. After all, books are the main repository of culture. We should organize a committee on culture under the president which would be superior to

the Ministry of Culture and which would intervene in such cases and either allow or prohibit the export of cultural assets.

Our impressionist and post-impressionist works at the Hermitage have been "worn out" by tours and are inaccessible to our young artists. This is completely wrong.

N.N. Gubenko knows the situation. I am completely implacable toward what is going on at the Hermitage. Just as Piotrovskiy was toward this. When he fell ill, the labor collective took upon itself the right to dispose of our national cultural assets. The situation in which labor collectives or management dispose of national assets is intolerable. And the declaration must state that.

Sixth: The declaration acknowledges that culture workers in our country must be given conditions to ease their work and granted benefits. After all, they are teachers and educators. You will recall that Bismarck said that he won the war with Austria thanks to his governess because the best teachers are in Germany and Austria. This should also apply to librarians, archivists, museum workers—who deal directly with cultural monuments—actors, artists, musicians, and all creative people.

Seventh: The declaration acknowledges the need to discuss the organization of artistic education and the training of art restorers. It is in a simply calamitous state in our country; there is a shortage of art specialists even in Moscow. Therefore, customs officials, militia workers, and so on must receive training in art appreciation and secondary art education. There must be many more art critics and a whole series of professions, particularly in law enforcement, must be given training in the arts.

Last of all: The declaration acknowledges the need to expand the teaching of humanitarian disciplines in schools on the premise that educational levels and culture are the conditions of successful labor in the spheres of technology, the economy, trade, the natural sciences, and so forth.

M.S. Gorbachev: Thank you. I fully concur with those approaches. We have the desire to resolve these questions here but we lack the mechanisms to implement it. I do not know whether another committee should be created in addition to the Culture Ministry, but perhaps the culture minister should be on the Presidential Council and a council of cultural figures should be created under the Presidential Council?...

Voice from the hall: Right on.

M.S. Gorbachev: And hold more regular meetings.

**Speech by S.V. Mikhalkov**

I and all children's writers are worried by what is happening with our state's future now. Let us take children of young pioneer age. From an even earlier age, from seven to eight, children watch television, they talk with their parents and one another on the street, we do not hear these conversations but we know about them. In school—this is no anecdote but a fact—a child I know was supposed to read the text of the National Anthem and the teacher gave him an average grade for reading because the child said:. "And the country is falling apart." The boy had read this in a magazine. The mass media are carrying out a planned, systematic, daily campaign to discredit everything on which generations were brought up. I do not want to delve into the history of this major question, because it has affected the whole country, but state symbols are being compromised, the text of the anthem is being mocked—people say the words are out of date: There is no "friendship of the peoples," Russia did not unite anything, and so forth. Everything is changing all around: Streets are being renamed, monuments are being taken down. And each day the press persists in reporting it.

A group sings: "Good old grandad Lenin, you were so good, we are your grandchildren, but we have no bread, we have no potatoes; but the cause lives on, better if the cause had died and you had remained alive." This is what some groups sing. What is going on in the minds of children and adolescents?

I do not know how this will end or how to react to it. I do know one thing: The only means of influencing young people and children is literature, the movies, theater. But what is going on there? There is no profit in printing children's literature: The books do not bring much money. With tremendous difficulty and help from Comrade Dzasokhov, among others, the Children's Literature publishing house—the only one of its kind in the Soviet Union—has gotten back paper which had previously been taken from it; this didn't happen even in the Great Patriotic War. But the "Detskaya Kniga" [Children's Literature] factory refuses to print children's literature because it has concluded contracts with cooperatives and is busy printing their booklets. The factories do not care what they print, the main thing is to make more money. Meanwhile, children's literature is trapped. Not to mention the lack of school workbooks. And when we say that everything is getting better for children, that is a lie.

Previously we brought children up to be honest Leninists. But they called Brezhnev, Chernenko, Romanov, Grishin—all of them—major Leninists and then it turned out that they were not true Leninists at all. Now the schools no longer bring children up to be true Leninists, they avoid that. What is to be done? On the large scale, the state scale—I do not know, because I am not a big-time politician, as they say, but in my sphere of work I think that a tragedy is occurring: with children's literature, children's theater. Where is children's theater now? Adult plays are being performed there. And no matter how hard we try, people do not put on plays for little children because it is not profitable. But how hard R. Bykov struggles. What effort it took him to organize a children's movie center. They produced "The Golden

Sword," a fine movie, but one swallow does not make a summer. There is no children's movie industry. The Gorkiy studio does not produce children's movies, it makes movies for adults, detective movies, which are profitable, they just are not children's movies.

**Speech by M.F. Shatrov**

I want to begin with a comment which is perhaps a personal one but it is very fundamental to me. I want to most firmly support the president's Supreme Soviet speech on A.I. Solzhenitsyn's article. This speech was very serious, important, and necessary for the country, although I am very well aware that it set some people's teeth on edge. Undoubtedly he is a great writer and thinker but at the same time a man whose political views I do not share on a number of points. We have been conducting this polemic for a long time now and I shall try to generalize what divides us. There is an opinion that everything which has happened in our country is the essence of Marxism and Leninism. For me, however, this is a bizarre and tragic distortion of the essence of Marxism-Leninism. Both sides seek arguments in practical life. I think that we should find our arguments in an implemented and victorious perestroyka. This is the main responsibility which has fallen to our generation.

I gave long thought to what I would say here and decided to share my subjective feelings so that everyone could compare them with their own. Doubtless I am wrong on some things but in any event I am going to speak with the full sincerity and anxiety that I feel every day. It seems to me that we are sliding into difficult times. I am not saying that there is a paralysis of power but it is in a jelly-like state. Extremist wings are growing to the right and left and social hysteria is being fueled.

Conservatives and democrats in the party have a stranglehold on one another, they have effectively paralyzed themselves and are doing nothing but spew out thousands of new sections, platforms, statements, and incomplete tenets which no one reads or wants to read. The vast potential of several millions of democratically minded Communists who are ready to follow you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, has not been used. People are confused, they sit around doing nothing, and many people are beginning to think that they should leave the party.

The idea of a strong left-center bloc is being floated, but attempts to create one are being undermined by political ambitions and people who shamelessly use democracy to build a career. It is reaching the point where people who call themselves democrats scream: "We should not go pick the potatoes because this strengthens the administrative-command system." In other words: The worse the better. Better for whom? I think that our intelligentsia also bears its share of responsibility for the unthinking mood of destruction and the atmosphere of hysteria in the country.

The experience of many revolutions shows that the intelligentsia has the ability to rock the boat. But the question is whether it is capable of controlling it when terrible waves form and radical forces surface which will not only sweep the intelligentsia from the captain's bridge but from the ship itself? Perhaps we should consider that? Perhaps we should recall the experience of recent months and the fate of those forces in countries close to us who began changes there? Where are they now? And perhaps we should remember the experience of our own 1917? Yes, we began to rock the boat, to dismantle it, but we should rock it more carefully. And ensure in this situation that it is common sense that rules rather than the logic of the struggle, which says: "If Gorbachev says yes, we say no, and vice versa."

It is a strange logic. I would like to recall the words of S.Yu. Vitte on the radicalism of our intelligentsia. Broadly speaking he said that our intelligentsia is like a chess player who, seeing that the game is already won and has just one more move to call mate, suddenly jumps up, grabs the board, and begins to beat his opponent about the head with it. I have an almost physical feeling that it is not common sense that is ruling the roost today but emotions, the logic of the struggle hiding behind democratic phraseology, but behind all this there is bare political ambition in all its repulsive nakedness. I want power! If a dramatist has become president over there, why cannot I, a senior lecturer or junior scientific staffer, run the USSR? This is not our specific task. There are people like that everywhere, but the characteristic feature here is that it all happens against a background of empty phrases.

No one has ever managed to overcome an economic crisis in conditions of a democracy dominated by rallies. In the years of the Great Depression, the U.S. Senate gave Roosevelt emergency powers and no one in the country shouted that democracy was going to perish. We are shouting that because we have the shadow of Stalin hanging over us and a terrible past, the terrible starvation behind us. But despite all this I am convinced that we have no other path. The future society in which there is only one dictatorship—the dictatorship of conscience—demands that there be a dictatorship of the law today. In my view, this is possible only by a sharp increase in presidential power to be done not merely in declarations, words, or on paper.

I have to make one more remark here. I think that all the recent speeches from the government and academics, and, forgive me, sometimes even presidential decrees have suffered from the fact that people do not understand them. I consider myself a quite well educated reader but I cannot fathom this juggling of economic terms. Yet these documents are intended not for narrow specialists in the economic sphere but for ordinary people. Presidential decrees should be comprehensible to every ordinary normal person.

I can imagine how offensive it must be for a man who had unlimited power in 1985 and who, with his colleagues, consciously began a process of destroying that power, a process of democratization, to hear charges that

he is attacking democracy. Nevertheless, this has to be endured. This is not important. The revolution is more valuable than our self-esteem. The most important thing today is to save perestroyka. Without a firm power, and a consistent power, we cannot save the revolution.

But for that power to be a power it needs support and it is necessary to begin working on that without delay. I am convinced, Mikhail Sergeyevich, that millions of people are prepared to reach out their hand to you today, but they must feel that your hand is there, the hand of a man who has understood that in the days of a revolution trying to find the golden mean is like trying to catch your own shadow. Deplorable as this may be, today, right now is not the time for consensus with the extreme left and extreme right but the time to be definite and ready to shoulder the responsibility for the fate of the revolution and the country. That is how I understand the reasons which have made you take the stage today. I have in mind the law on additional powers for the president, and I wholly and fully support it.

I think that both you and we are experiencing these psychological attacks and charges of a return to totalitarianism. People's feelings and fundamental interests sometimes do not coincide. The attacks will disappear with the first signs of improvement of the situation. But it would be far worse if you and we come to write memoirs entitled "The Time of Missed Opportunities." But perhaps we will not be given the chance to do that.

With a full and clear understanding of your motives and with a full and clear acceptance of the strategic goals which you have proclaimed, on behalf of those people who share my viewpoint, I want to express to you my full and undiluted support. And at the same time I want to recall Vladimir Ilich's words in 1918 in what was roughly a very similar situation: Unless we make desperate efforts to make the jelly set, we will come unstuck.

**Speech by F.M. Burlatskiy**

First I would like to say a few words about the present role of culture, because we are entering a quite difficult transitional period and it is necessary to think about some general directions of our activity. For five years to a greater or lesser extent we have all taken part in the destruction of the administrative system and of those values which in fact no longer operate. It seems to me that the time has now come to embark on a period of creative activity and cultural rebirth and struggle for it by common efforts. Because without constructive and constant work to revive the moral spirit of our people, perestroyka will not produce anything. We will not create that kind of dynamic person who is to be the driving force of both parliamentary life and the free economic system that we call the market. This seems extraordinarily important to me.

The second thing I would like to say is that we are now faced with the fact of a definite collapse in national culture. Previously we had a single culture in the country. Now culture is starting to break up and become compartmentalized on ethnic lines. Of course, national revival is inevitable. But if we stay too long at this stage our entire cultural revival, like the cause of perestroyka, could crumble. That is why we need to put our heads together to ensure that culture becomes the cement binding all nations and peoples together. For good or ill, ideology is already taking a back seat to some extent. And, I believe, it is culture, with its new values, that should become the cementing ideology behind our reunification. There is no other cement, comrades. Even economic interests will not do, since they are always egoistic.

I cannot fail to say a few words about what M.F. Shatrov said about Solzhenitsyn. This is one of the most complex phenomena in our culture. We cannot fail to see the evolution which Solzhenitsyn has undergone in his work, in coming to proclaim civil peace and oppose civil war, in defending presidential power, essentially upholding the agrarian program which we ratified, and defending community self-administration, which is the basis of state power.

I, of course, do not in the slightest accept ideas connected with the unraveling of the country into separate ethnic units, and a number of other ideas. But why should we not be fighting Solzhenitsyn, when we know all about his fate? Moreover, look at how the Russian idea is now being interpreted in the country. It is extremistically counterposed to other peoples, whereas Solzhenitsyn's Russian idea under any circumstances is the idea of combining the Russian people and the Russian spirit with our country's other peoples. That is why we should be in no hurry to reject things—let us espouse what is particularly valuable in this major phenomenon....

One other question—an organizational matter. I wholly support D.S. Likhachev's idea: We need to act together to protect culture. Not on our own with our intellectual appeals, but as an organized force. We all need to pool our efforts and struggle professionally for the interests of culture, both in the Supreme Soviet and by means of the law.

Now to turn to the independent press. Its emergence will be inevitable under the new law, and nobody should be offended by it. Whether a labor collective or a creative union takes responsibility—the main thing is that these new forms should promote press cooperation with cultural and literary figures.

And one other question—filthy profit, so to speak. Unfortunately, there is no getting away from it when you are talking about culture. Look what happened to the new tax system. We were duped. I say that quite responsibly.

Voice from the auditorium: Absolutely right.

F.M. Burlatskiy: Anyone here would say the same. We were duped by the finance minister and certain commissions during the discussion at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

I raised this issue repeatedly and received false information about what the new law would mean. What has happened? Royalties are subject to 60 percent tax. Even the leader of the All-Union Copyright Agency did not foresee this. A 60-percent tax rate means that all other taxes have been moved up too, although we were told at the preliminary stage that royalties would be taxed at 45 percent. And everything falls correspondingly into line. This strikes a blow against real writers who spend years writing their books, and at real literature, rather than at those who publish today and tomorrow depending on market conditions. This was not what should have been adopted.

The second question concerns the taxation of enterprises. What has happened to our newspaper, for instance? Why are we now in conflict to a certain extent with our beloved Writers' Union? Our newspaper, and this probably applies to many others, has to pay double what it previously paid—one-third. With the 45 percent in ordinary taxes and the 35 percent to the Writers' Union, we are paying a total of 80 percent tax. How can I survive in competitive conditions when business people and all the others financed by the West appear on the scene? How will we be able to modernize our business?

I ask you, Mikhail Sergeyevich—and I think that the comrades will support me—to issue a special decree and make amendments to fiscal policy regarding culture. This would be a colossal gesture by presidential power. Not everyone in the Supreme Soviet understands the importance of culture as the foundation of society. I ask you to examine the question of drawing up a special decree to amend fiscal policy regarding royalties and the taxation of enterprises and institutions of culture and art.

M.F. Shatrov: Fedor Mikhaylovich has misunderstood me because I subscribe to what he has said. I only welcomed the president's assessment of some of Solzhenitsyn's ideas and restated the points on which the writer and I differ...

**Speech by N.N. Gubenko**

We need to be very cautious not to place the president in danger of being criticized for his decrees. Take the proposal to regulate taxation practice—we should not shift onto the president something that he can only recommend to the Supreme Soviet....

Voice from the auditorium: He is entitled to do this under the last law....

N.N. Gubenko: But it would be better if he did not exercise that right, because the Supreme Soviet should nonetheless decide the matter itself. You voted for that....

M.S. Gorbachev: The question of how the president should exercise this right is very complex. Often in order to fully exercise a right we have to go against ourselves and everything we have begun. Where should we stop—that is the big question. Nonetheless, the time has come, we must act. I will speak of this again.

N.N. Gubenko: I have never complained about personal circumstances however they may have developed, but, when it is a question of the integrity of the state and the country, it seems to me that it would not be out of place for all of us here to complain. To a certain extent we are experiencing intolerance and aggression toward superior state structures on the part of all lower-level components. Everyone's looking for a scapegoat somewhere up the line—preferably in the center.

But this could lead to the destruction not only of the economy, but also of the spiritual and moral environment. Naturally we have not been used to freedom ever since the notorious thirties. We are choking on this unaccustomed freedom and destroying the cultural and historical tradition which, as the result of many centuries of history—from Kievan Rus through Tatar Rus and Peter the Great's Russia—has united a huge number of nations in one territory and given them the name of USSR. I think that culture, morality, and faith should make their contribution to this melting pot of sovereignties currently developing in our country, so that we can preserve our country.

Seeing culture as the integral whole formed by the organic interdependence of intellectual, moral, and aesthetic factors, the main point today, in my view, when concluding a Union treaty is to envisage the inclusion in it of the corresponding powers to allow the USSR to pursue an all-Union cultural policy in conjunction with the components of the federation. Under the conditions of sovereignty there is no answer to the question of whether the Union or a republic is entitled to hold full sway in the cultural sphere. But if it is a question of who is entitled and obliged to promote its development, there can only be one answer: Everyone who wants to be concerned about culture—from individuals to the Union government and the Presidential Council.

We need an all-Union cultural policy to preserve the Union as a sovereign state, irrespective of whether it is federal or adopts another structure. A common economic environment presupposes a common cultural environment. This includes freedom of movement around the country, the existence of unified armed forces, and participation in international relations as an integrated state unit. Today everyone, from housing operations office to Presidential Council, is indeed interpreting themselves as the center of the universe. This could be catastrophic, since it could lead to the complete collapse of all kinds of state structures.

We can, for instance, dream up republics of one kind or another on the basis of scientific research. But a spiritual-territorial division is impossible, because more than 60 million people live outside their national formations. How can we implement an all-Union cultural policy if we divide everything up among the republics? It gets

absurd when people say that everything Russian should be in Russian museums and Russian libraries, while everything Lithuanian should be in Lithuanian museums. Questions are raised about redistributing museum treasures which have been acquired over centuries.

The story of the collection which turned up in 1915 in Voronezh, where the emperor had sent it during World War I, is well-known. Now Estonia is raising the question of the return of the collection. But in whose name? In 1915 Estonia was just a province of the tsarist empire. There are many legal questions in this area, and if we start redistributing museum and literary treasures, we will never get anywhere.

It turns out that the brass section of a symphony orchestra is saying it has its own sovereignty, the strings have their own sovereignty, and the percussion section has its sovereignty—but none of them want the conductor to lead them. The symphony in this case is the program for the transition to the market economy, and the compositional structure is, quite clearly, the Union treaty. This means that we must reach agreement on what score we are playing and what republic or autonomous entity is playing what in that score. Then everyone will follow the conductor—the Presidential Council and the president.

If we recognize that we need to implement an all-Union policy, then we need some kind of organ—presidential committee, Ministry of Culture, or whatever—to implement what is stipulated by the law (to direct, encourage, and coordinate) within the framework of the law on limiting the powers of the Union and the components of the federation. We discussed this with Yu.M. Solomin, the new RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] minister—he became involved in the process slightly later, but in principle it has been agreed with all the republics' leading cultural figures without exception. They have agreed to join in certain state structures to ensure that the Soviet of the Republics, the creative unions, and representatives of allied departments in the shape of academies, the State Committee for Cinematography, the Academy of Arts, and the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting distribute what should be the financial and organizational core of this all-Union cultural policy.

This should be some kind of fund formed on the basis of a stable share of the budget. Otherwise the republics will have no interest in implementing all-Union coordination.

We are currently shaping the country's budget as an exceptionally huge military budget plus fuel, energy, and transport budgets. We are not envisaging any allocations for culture from the Union budget in 1991. This means we recognize that we are becoming in practice divided, sovereign states. If this is so, it will not be possible to implement an all-Union policy. Unification and coordination will be impossible. We are becoming a military-political bloc which will replace the Warsaw Pact. That would be a catastrophe.

If we agree that there is an all-Union policy and there is a fund which is the core of that policy, then we must realize and make the republics realize that there is also a concept of state ownership. Approaches in this area differ. Russia in particular believes—and so do I—that everything should be allocated within the framework of a Union treaty, but in principle each republic says that everything on its territory belongs to it.

Well, what sort of question is this? It is not a question of property or the right to deal with it, but of ensuring that everyone is concerned about culture.

M.S. Gorbachev: But then formations have historically taken shape in science and culture which tackle tasks and meet the needs of our entire vast territory. After all, this community of peoples has taken shape over centuries, not just decades. In general, isolation in science, culture, and so forth is the road to confrontation. We even feel that we lost a great deal when our scientific ties were restricted for a certain period. We lost so much! Only intelligence services were able to obtain information, and this was called "scientific exchange."

Contacts are now starting to produce results, bringing into action the brainpower that our country has never lacked, and everyone has an interest in these contacts. We have been tardy, and you have been tardy here. Sometimes many of our scientists' ideas cannot be implemented because there is no apparatus or funds to implement them.

And I am not even talking about culture! What will happen if we tear all this human fabric asunder! In general, the more I looked into all these matters—both human and territorial—and into the multilayered nature of the people's settlement patterns, the better I realized that if we preserve the country (and I think that we should do everything to that end, the people will not allow us to do otherwise) then nobody will divide us. Only 30 percent of our territories' borders are defined by state acts, while 70 percent are defined by rayon soviets. Since this is so, we need to take another look at all these borders. And it turns out that, on the basis of the democratization of all relations and taking account of a correct conception of the interests of republics and peoples—even numerically small peoples—we find ourselves back once again with what has emerged over the centuries. So we are cursing the unitary state, but it did exist. It had its own economy, and ties emerged under it—just try to break them now.

Incidentally, those who tried first are now encountering insurmountable problems. Russia itself understood this, it provided the impetus for the elaboration of a Union economic program.

It is no accident that all the barriers are being broken in West Europe and that a search is under way for opportunities to further build up contacts so as to ensure that integration trends develop still further. The other thing is that we want to bury everything that was unitary and deprived the peoples of the republics—including Russia—of the chance to feel that they were masters of their own fate. We are rejecting everything that is unacceptable and getting rid of everything that is unnecessary....

Voice from the auditorium: Mikhail Sergeyevich, we have already gone to absurd lengths on territorial and ownership questions. Krasnaya Presnya has declared its airspace to be sovereign, and another rayon is concluding direct diplomatic relations with Japan.

M.S. Gorbachev: Remember what Saltykov-Shchedrin said: Even the worst laws will not do Russia much harm, because their shortcomings will be remedied by the failure to carry the law out.

N.N. Gubenko: It is virtually impossible to highlight any general principles for determining the general national status of various cultural facilities, or for their collaboration with local authorities. In the broadest terms cultural and historical tradition, current circumstances, and common sense are important. What is being done in the international community on this issue? How is the general national status of certain cultural facilities determined?

First, by their general national importance and symbolic value in consolidating the state. Then by historical traditions, custom, and, finally, their importance for international prestige in representing the state or the nation and as a symbol of immutable statehood. By the need for the central authorities to use their prestige to support certain cultural initiatives, experiments, or artistic innovations. By the need to implement a definite targeted government cultural program, and so forth.

This is just common sense. We now have quite different approaches: Give me what is mine—and that is it. But why, one wonders, should Solomin have to take over the Bolshoy Theater (which carries out all-Union orders for training the next generation of ballet dancers), the Lenin Library (which draws up normative and methodological recommendations for the entire Union), the Tretyakov Gallery, or the Hermitage.... Take the Tretyakov—to which the Union, Russia, and Moscow are currently staking claims. Yet its collection is made up not only of the Tretyakov gift, but of pictures acquired by the Union or presented by foreign partners—which presented them as gifts to the Union as an integrated state. This represents a huge proportion of the collection.... Should it really be split up?

There are two practical issues. The interstate accord on cultural exchanges with 48 of the 81 countries with which we have relations expires at the end of the year. We are virtually unable to extend these agreements owing to the willful and hard-line position adopted by the Moscow City Soviet, which has decided to charge foreign nationals—irrespective of their country of origin or profession—hard currency for hotel accommodation and transportation. We will not be able to sustain this—we simply do not have the money. I would like to place it on record that if we continue like this we will have to end cultural contacts with 50 countries. In my view, the Union treaty needs to make provision for appropriate powers to allow the Union to implement all-Union cultural policy and to finance culture and art together with the republics. We need additional sources of financing. Enterprises now have a chance to channel one percent of their profits into culture. I can call the general director of the Likhachev Motor Vehicle Plant and say: "Give me a couple of million to increase the salaries of my symphony orchestras, which are collapsing, or of my Bolshoy Theater soloists." He says: "Why, I myself have 19 culture centers." People do not understand that they have the opportunity on their own territories and in their own regions to help culture through the Law on Taxation. No one wants to contribute, yet this percentage is exempt from tax. But their minds are so set that they are unable to comprehend. In short, a decree on culture is essential.

**Speech by S.P. Zalygin**

Since it is cultural representatives who are gathered here, we should, of course, primarily discuss the state of culture. At the same time I imagine that you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, have assembled us here not only for us to talk about our own needs. The situation is so critical and so serious that we must obviously go beyond our specialism and speak merely as citizens.

I think that the time has come for the intelligentsia to somehow be called to account. I have the following questions. First, what has the intelligentsia done? Second, what has it not done? And, third, what has it accomplished?

We have accomplished a great deal. I think that the members of the intelligentsia are very much to blame for a large part of the situation our nationalities policy is now in. They were the instigators of all the problems in this sphere which we are currently unable to disentangle.

For some reason we have made no attempt to report on our actions: What do we actually do? A person speaks at the Supreme Soviet or somewhere else, canvasses people, makes appeals, but I always have the urge to ask: "Does this person work or do anything apart from being a deputy, apart from being a speaker? Would it not be better for him to talk about the situation in the institution which he heads?

Everyone has become a critic in our country. This too began with us. There is no serious dialogue on television or in the press. We very rarely see two participants conversing who are worthy of one another. Has there been even one television program of this kind? There has not. We could get rid of all manner of light entertainment programs ultimately for the sake of serious problems of this kind. If our session were now relayed on

television, what would people say with hand on heart? We can predict that people at kolkhozes and plants would say: They are talking rubbish again. Yet there is no butter, you name it, we have not got it. So, some quite decisive, quite concrete steps, above all economic steps, are what is needed now.

We spend all our time talking about what the economy should be like and what direction it should take. But in order to talk about what kind of economy there should be and what kind of direction it should take, you have to have an economy, and then think about what to do with this object. But we have nothing and we are talking about what we would do if we had one. I am no economist, I do not know how to do this, but if we do not change the material situation now—if only a little—if we do not give the people something, all these programs of ours will be worthless.

The people have no confidence in the government, the president, or the intelligentsia as a whole, confidence must be created. Perhaps workers' control teams should be formed—like during the revolution—to tackle issues relating to control. The entire people could be involved in this matter, they have after all only learned to talk from us. We will change nothing until we give the people something concrete—however small. We ourselves launched the people on the path of discussion. We have to start from zero. But you know that we now have a negative value and still have to reach the zero from which we have to begin, our point of departure.

Mikhail Shatrov said here that he does not understand many of our people who speak on the economy. I also do not understand them. I think that the point is that they themselves do not have a very good grasp of what we are discussing now. Let us reduce these tasks to limits that everyone can understand. Say, the nationalities problem. It is very simple and only arises when there are no other problems. If a person lacks moral ideas or any other ideas, or they have been destroyed, then nationalism comes to the fore. I must say that "Pamyat" in the Baltic republics, say, is no better than the Russian "Pamyat." The result is one and the same. I think that the time has come for both the Presidential Council and the president to put aside in-depth principled discussions. We have to survive now. We need a solution to the current situation. We have to work on the basis of this extraordinary situation today.

**Speech by A.I. Kamshalov**

The development of the movie industry is subject to great difficulties and contradictions at present, and this is causing us much concern, although there is also evidence of certain positive changes. In comparison with 1985, for instance, enterprise profits have doubled. We are switching to market relations and are already opening our eighth movie market. Admittedly we are sustaining bumps and bruises, but we are nonetheless learning to operate in the new market conditions. In a number of the country's regions alternative markets are forming which are providing us with both positive and negative experience.

Over the past three years alone there have been 300 debuts in our movie industry. This is a considerable step forward. Young people have joined the movie industry, and they are talented people. When Rolan Antonovich Bykov held a festival of these debuts, a simply vast number of interesting young people came to the fore. That is our gain.

The freedom and independence which have been granted to movie enterprises and movie studios are unquestionably an asset. But unfortunately many of our comrades, above all artistes and studios, perceive this freedom as total license. Hence the lack of responsibility, sometimes a total lack of it, on the part of artists, and not just young artists. This engenders a problem which cannot but cause concern—the commercialization of art which destroys the soul, destroys the moral health of the people. Therefore I very much back the legislative initiative of the CPSU Central Committee which at a recent Central Committee Secretariat meeting proposed that a law on the moral health of our country's population, and in particular children, be adopted. This is a very important legislative initiative by the party. But it is necessary for all of us to step up our efforts in this direction.

We are concerned about the shortage of children's movies, children's literature, and so forth. There are only a few children's drama and music theaters in the country. Their repertoire is by no means a children's repertoire. We have a very poor publishing base for children's literature, and especially children's textbooks. Of 152,000 sets of movie equipment in the whole of our vast country, only 400 serve children's auditoriums, and these auditoriums seat only between 200 and 300 people. This cannot but cause concern. We need a special state program for the development of children's literature and art. Not simply for children and juveniles, not simply for children and young people, but especially for children, and primarily very young children. Because we may lose this generation today unless we arrest this destructive process in time. What we need is not a 10-year program a year from now. We need it right now. We are prepared to contribute to this, and it would be useful, Mikhail Sergeyevich, if there were some kind of instruction from the president of the Soviet Union to this effect.

Special concern is caused by the explosion of video piracy. This explosion has been virtually legalized on a statewide scale. It is not simply a question of a few cooperatives. It is primarily a question of 25,000 video establishments in the country which are putting out between approximately 10,000 and 15,000 pirated video programs which have not been bought by the Soviet side, and as a result making R10-15 billion a year, according to the most conservative estimates. These funds go to the Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League], the trade unions, the consumer services system,

bars, and so forth. Meanwhile the state lacks precisely R10-15 billion for the development of culture.

In a number of the world's countries there are laws penalizing the distribution of pirated video products. In France this means two years and a fine of 200,000 francs with the confiscation of all property. In certain provinces in China this offense carries the death penalty. I do not favor capital punishment, but I favor a law to combat video piracy. We have already prepared a draft of such a law, and it seems to us that the adoption of this law would be justified.

Taxes were mentioned here. I would like to say a few words about taxes on video salons and video halls. It has been decided to tax them at 70 percent. While all other enterprises and organizations are paying 45 percent, video salons are to pay 70 percent. This appears to be a blow aimed at cooperatives and the shadow economy. However, this blow is going to hurt above all the state video network, while cooperatives are lining their pockets now, and will continue to line their pockets in future. They will merely go underground and offer video services at prices that are higher still.

No matter how difficult this may be for the state, it is necessary to join the Vienna Convention. This has been aired for many years. Both last year and this year the USSR foreign minister declared twice that we would join the Vienna Convention. The Ministry of Finance has said that at the moment it simply does not have the 10 million in hard currency which is required as the accession fee. We need the accession fee in order to jointly, collectively combat the explosion of video piracy on the basis of existing laws on an international scale. This piracy is inflicting not just economic but also and above all moral damage on our society.

Ours is a special kind of production process, comprising creative forces, science, production, hire, a network of movie theaters, and industry. But without the necessary raw materials and other materials we will perish today. Approximately 400 feature films will have been produced to date in 1990, but our base is obsolete. At the "Mosfilm" studio 87 percent of the equipment is worn out. The Gorkiy studio and the "Soyuzmultfilm" are also in a perilous state.

The situation regarding film supplies is very bad. We cannot live without film. In 1989 there were two government resolutions on film. We need a billion meters of color film. In 1989 only 600 million meters were produced; in 1990—450 million, and the plan for 1991 is 380 million. Only a third of the requirement. This means that we will have to reduce circulation tomorrow. We cannot survive without film, we cannot survive without raw materials. Meanwhile the chemical industry is failing to implement all the decisions.

Some time in the past I asked Sergey Vladimirovich Mikhalkov to let off a "rocket" in this connection. It was done and for a time it was effective, our supplies of film increased slightly.

A law on culture was mentioned here. A draft law on the movie industry is also ready. It needs support.

In conditions of acute interethnic relations there have been no clashes in the movie industry, perhaps because of the movie studios' collectivist working methods. Furthermore, all the republics without exception are ready jointly with us to draft and sign a Union treaty on cooperation among cinematographers. It could be done within the current year, which would be right and useful.

A paradoxical situation has taken shape in education. Here is just one example, again connected with the formulation of the 1991 budget. We have been allocated, as yet on a preliminary basis, R204.7 million. That is twice as much as last year. In our country the financing of the entire movie industry is under Union jurisdiction. But there are a number of educational establishments, in particular the two-year advanced courses for screenwriters and producers from which, as everyone knows, the best Soviet screenwriters and producers of today have graduated, which will have to be closed down. Not one kopek has been allocated to these estabishments in the 1991 budget. Not one kopek! Last year, by government decision, a Skill Enhancement Institute was set up in our country. Tens of thousands of people are training there. But we have not received a single kopek for this institute.

**Speech by M.A. Zakharov**

We are trying to cast off neofeudal structures and move in the direction of a flourishing, civilized, and economically developed state. I personally know from world experience that money must be used unstintingly on three priorities—public education, culture, and fundamental scientific research.

I class medicine under culture and state assets. When the state grows rich and people acquire culture, they begin to understand that populist slogans about free pills and free enemas no longer work and that a proper industry is needed. This is self-evident, as it were. Cybernetics and information science in general are underdeveloped in our country. We do not fully understand the role and influence of culture.

By forcibly deporting the best professors, philosophers, and publicists from the country, depleting the cultural and intellectual potential of the Russian multinational state, we enabled the anarchic criminal elements, criminal-thinking elements, to get to the top, elements which subsequently exerted such a strong influence on our history. We are still feeling the effects of this now. After all, many things were kept in place through fear. Now that people are no longer afraid, it has emerged that there is no real purposeful mainstay holding everything together.

What is my view of presidential power? Whereas I was competent to some extent at the public affairs level, back during the first Congress of People's Deputies, for instance, just like 80 to 90 percent of our deputies, now,

during the transition to the market, during the analysis of the Shatalin program and other schemes, I no longer command the necessary economic, legal, and political knowledge, the crucial knowledge necessary to analyze what happened in Bolivia, to judge Pinochet's merits, to know what brains he relied on when he tried to raise his half-wild, turbulent country to new levels of economic development. I am unable to forecast how the ideas of the Chicago economic school will develop. Here I would like to put my trust into major specialists, preferably with international computer support, although I have a lot of respect for Shatalin and many of our other economists. When people say that all this is a matter for deputies, it seems to me that we should not be misled here. After all, 80-90 percent of deputies are dilettantes in some respects. There are good people, and excellent producers and musicians among them. But this level is no longer sufficient in order to adopt fundamental laws which will determine our future.

And another point. The one percent for social needs which is not subject to taxation is obviously too little. In developed countries this percentage is much higher. Now I will say something that may be unpleasant. The words "private property" are almost taboo in our country. You will understand that the leaders of major enterprises will not now provide funds for the Bolshoy Theater.

People will give money when they reach the level of a Rockefeller, a Bakhrushin, Mamontov, or Morozov, so to speak, that is when they are rich, richer than the president, richer than all artists and all "stars," richer than anyone. Then, such a person, coming to terms with God, or his conscience, or whatever, depending on who he is, will give money for social needs. But making the rounds at factories saying "please support culture" is up to a point utopia, I believe.

The time during which a person is successful, flourishes, and is able to earn well is not long. During this time people who are capable of filling halls or attracting the interest of a readership or an audience ought to be given the opportunity to earn well, and this applies also to enterprises of our social organizations and the Union of Theater Workers. Theaters should not be stifled by new taxes. I am not asking for anything. I understand that everyone is appealing to the president, or the government in general. This well-established reflex will probably only be eradicated when the present generation is gone. Gimme, gimme, gimme money, gimme money. But at least let them not take away what we have. Let us keep the few crumbs, so to speak, and give us the opportunity of commercializing within the sensible framework of the law. There are forms of commercial activity which make it possible to support symphony orchestras and fund artists who do not write to order but create works of art which may be of a fundamental importance.

A word about the brain drain. It is frightening to watch outstanding people leaving our country.

Now about the theater. We cannot make ends meet. The theater and artists cannot earn as much as Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov, the Moscow City Soviet chairman, has just promised the bakers. I understand that bread baking is an important trade and that in the present times it is probably necessary to pay them R500. But at no time in our lives will I or artists ever draw such money under our salary scales. We cannot and will not ask for anything because we understand that times are difficult for the state. We must rely on our own resources but we would appreciate it if we were not pushed up against the wall in this respect.

I am in favor of strong presidential power with unlimited potential for a period of time. This is because I am convinced that Soviet power, which was conceived as a self-management structure, was to some extent populist and somewhat partisan in nature. I do not want to belittle any of the great people of our past, but we are aware now that this structure of self-management has lead to a sort of anarchy. People who have been elected believed that subsequently they are not subordinate to anyone. Therefore I would like to entrust my future and my interests not to the body of deputies of whom I myself am one, not to the Soviets (although I know that they comprise respected and very clever people), but to the president who, understanding the crucial period of our history, I am convinced will find in himself the strength to steer us through this terribly difficult period and stage of our history.

**Speech by Yu.V. Bondarenko**

I believe that not just our culture but also our economy are currently in a historical snare. It is possible to cite here a great deal of evidence, arguments, or simply utterances which we all hear in the streets, while waiting in line, in stores, during our conversations with workers and milkmaids. I would say that there is a certain background sociomoral tension which is rather like a taut string that is about to break.

Therefore the time has probably come for us now no longer to make speeches in the senate as in the times of Cicero and Cripps, but to act. Words are also action, of course. But these words must not pass between you and me, they must not be used to rouse, unite, or disunite us. These words must be among the people. Why have we ended up in this dire situation? Because we have disrupted the triad—statehood, national character, and faith. I do not mean faith in the narrow sense here. This has brought nothing good to our country. It brought a succession of destructions, the consequences of which we are all feeling and having to suffer today.

May the representatives of our press and mass media forgive me when I tell them the gist of what I have been thinking in recent years. We took up the terms "democracy," "freedom," and "glasnost" with extraordinary enthusiasm. Subsequently this enthusiasm turned into inertia, and now it is evoking feelings of a different kind. Sometimes, Mikhail Sergeyevich, I feel like defining our

glasnost—speaking about its one-sidedness, speaking about its extremist orientation, speaking about its destructive tendency—as a lie which looks more like the truth than truth itself. Our glasnost has destroyed the past, it has destroyed the foundations. You cannot build a house on thin air. I have been rebuked for a long time because I am against destroying the foundations. But the foundations are our history, our roots, our spirituality, our culture, and our economy. If you like, we are probably not yet dying of starvation only because there still are such things as sovkhozes and kolkhozes [state and collective farms]. On the basis of what had been achieved, we should have gone forward. But we destroyed what we had been destroying before—generally speaking, the soil which we needed to walk on. We became divorced from the soil. And everything stemmed from that.

The press, our extremist press, which I describe as such without flinching, is still destroying everything that keeps man on earth. What is the purpose of the press? Is it to destroy man, destroy his faith in his father and mother, brothers and sisters, in love, in all human feelings, and in charity? No! It exists and was created by God for a specific task. Incidentally, a professional said to me: Why are you always going on about the press? You have been putting yourself in the firing line for the past five years. I told him that I will continue putting myself in the firing line until something changes.

Our press represents outright hatred of our land, our people, and our country. Nothing good comes from hatred, nothing good can be built on hatred.

I believe, Mikhail Sergeyevich, that you can do a great deal in the Presidential Council, and not just you, but also your ideologists, who, forgive me, are also in a state of collapse. I am talking about the ideology of faith, humanity, charity, and love for each other. Perhaps this is our true ideology which will evoke and is evoking sympathies toward us in the West and rally us all.

How we love to pronounce the word "revolution"... But what does this term mean? If it means a total change of social system then we must say so, rather than speaking about neofeudalism or postfeudalism. You have got to be honest: If we are going through a revolution, it means that we are changing the system and moving on to different conditions of life. It is no good trying to mislead each other, it has to be stated point blank, so that everyone is aware of this.

I would like presidential power to be used with that sense of proportion and respect for democracy and freedom which should be characteristic of our Russia.

**Speech by A.A. Belyayev**

We are now living through a very complex period, because we can see that the unified ideology has collapsed and many ideological dogmas and stereotypes have departed. Others, which had previously reigned as the only ones possible, have now been obliged to prove their right to exist. In this confusion only the resources of our subterranean depths and the treasury of our culture have remained unshakable values and steadfast for every person. The yawning abyss between the theory of socialism and the bitter practice of its Stalinist embodiment in the USSR has terrified people and cast doubt on the very rightness of socialism as a movement and practice. Different views of the future of the country and society are now emerging. "Down with October, Lenin, and the CPSU" is being heard increasingly loudly. Different centers are arising for various types of restoration, including the restoration of the monarchy. A foreign successor has started to stir. Other similar leaders have appeared.

Of course, they could all be treated as comic personages. But we must also think seriously and debunk their attempts. But new, serious, weighty, and comprehensible arguments in defense of the revolution, Lenin, and the CPSU must be accumulated. I should merely like the new thinking of a global, planetary scale to dominate this reasoning.

But what can we use now to draw people after us if it is not fresh, original thought not expressed in the form of a frontal attack? For instance, recently I have been pleased with the fact that PRAVDA has started to publish individual items attracting attention by virtue of their freshness of thought. But so far this is not of a mass nature.

Life demands protection and the democratic people's power demands protection. And the order which has been spoken about correctly here, the order which we yearned for so much, also requires legal protection. To this end we have published a whole series of laws but, alas, they do not operate, or operate so slackly and unconvincingly that doubts arise as to whether they exist. The fear of making swift and resolute use of power is leading to powerlessness, to rampaging crime, anarchy, and the growth of political tension in society. And this is having a direct adverse effect on culture and cultural processes. The weak will of executive power is reflected particularly destructively on the acceleration of the disintegration of Soviet multinational culture. It is indeed increasingly noticeably becoming multinational, but the uniting importance of the term "Soviet" is being lost.

Second: The creative unions in the form in which they were created by Stalin have obviously become exhausted. Over the five years of fundamental changes there has been no self-organization of cultural forces. In individual creative unions, forces have been precisely delimited according to views and have waged a group struggle among themselves. In my opinion the main trouble is that over the five years no precise positive path for the development of creative thought and the organization of creative forces has been elaborated.

And one last thing. I should like to dwell on the special position of culture in the countryside. Rural young

people remain to this day a second-rate species in terms of their provision with culture.

What do they construct in the cities? And how does it attract young people? Open-air dance halls, discotheques, movie theaters, disco bars, video rental stores, various studios, theaters, and so forth. And at the same time in the countryside, as was the case 50 years ago, they are vainly trying to construct 6,000 clubs and 500 culture centers on the basis of 50-year-old plans. Let us think about it: What we are constructing now we are constructing for the 21st century! In the 21st century will such clubs and culture centers be necessary to young people or to people in general with the development of video equipment, television, and new mass media? We do not look even 10 years ahead. I fear that the billion rubles released for the construction of centers like this of which, luckily, from my viewpoint, perhaps only half has been used in these five years, will simply be a waste of money.

And I shall perhaps be voicing a controversial idea, but I suggest that the money remaining from this billion rubles allocated by the agro-industrial complex be used for different cultural needs, perhaps to boost the wages of those who work in this sphere.

**Speech by G.V. Sviridov**

Before saying anything on my professional subject, I should like to say a few words about what I have heard here.

I very much like the declaration, except for two points.

If this declaration is widely published, it is necessary to formulate in a very delicate way the point concerning benefits and the systems of remuneration so that there is no state legalization of some elite strata, although the importance of this work should be stressed. In general I am against singling out anyone, my position has always been that each person works where life and his God-given vocation have placed him. And one more point—about education. For us musicians this is a very dubious element. In music there is in fact a huge number of critics, two faculties created by the conservatory, and a faculty of musicology.

I warmly welcome the idea of creating a cultural council. I do not know whether it needs to be under the president, at any rate it should be a high state council which should concentrate authoritative people. I also support the actual element of the defense of culture's rights. The very title of the declaration speaks of the alarming times in which we are living. Indeed, the times are very complex. I warmly welcome perestroyka. Far from all my life has been unclouded. My generation was formed during a simply terrible time of endless resolutions and persecutions and of course I feel no joy in recalling this.

But on the other hand you know that a man does not choose his time for himself. At all times very brilliant people have been formed and I by no means support the view which you often hear: Culture is in decline, there has been nothing, and so forth. That is the most absolute rubbish! If you take our literature, Soviet and Russian, it is a most imposing phenomenon. The era which we have lived through has been a hard one but it has not been deprived of grandeur, of that there is no doubt. From my viewpoint Russia is now the epicenter of world events of the 20th century and its fate is a hard one.

Now a few words about music. You hear it said that the Composers' Union is a totally useless organization. That is not true. Our music is not living through its best period now. During the years of perestroyka there have been no major new works and the standard of composition has declined—I do not know why. The Russian composers whom I know are somehow not part of the "aktiv" and seldom speak in the press. I am dismayed—after all, people are working. It is a difficult, transitional moment. The rush abroad of musical artistes, the gigantic advertising of profits through the press, are terrible. It is not like the flight of Rakhmaninov, who fled in fear of being killed, of being destroyed together with his entire family.

And our press? With the aid of the mass media we have returned to the nastiest thing of all—applying labels. This is being done by incompetents. Is that freedom of the press?... It is easier for writers, they can give as good as they get, but musicians are silent....

M.S. Gorbachev: Georgiy Vasilyevich, it began with a voice test. At the time the forces of perestroyka were fighting for dissent, for the pluralism of opinions. Now some of those who fought for democracy and pluralism seem to be prepared even to physically destroy an opponent.

G.V. Sviridov: That is true. And there is one more bad tendency, which I would call self-immersion [samooblivaniye]. In particular this applies, unfortunately, to Russian culture. I am a figure of Russian Soviet culture and it pains me. After all it is a vast culture. We have two major choir masters—Minin and Cherushenko. They have had a terrible life. And Yurlov was another such talent. He died at the age of 45 after being slighted, as a result of the terror of his environment.

It pains me that choral culture has, unfortunately, been kept down to a great extent. There was once Shelepin's "renowned" memorandum whereby all academic choirs were abolished. That was a grave incident. The foundation of musical culture is the underlying people's culture which has grown together with the Russian people. And it is this culture which must be supported by every means, and we now have opportunities of doing so. Choral culture started to be reborn spontaneously, by itself. Much here could be done by the church, because the musical education of each people begins with choral education, in the school and in the church and, finally, in life. In the United States, for instance, there are over 35,000 amateur choirs and of these approximately 20,000 sing to a professional standard. The Germans have 30,000 choirs.

Now about the leadership of our art. We still need order, state order. Art cannot exist only on the basis of patronage, although sponsors and patrons from abroad are both needed.

What do we need now? The Composers' Union must be a creative organization, must be concerned mainly with the quality of composition work, which is the center of the matter. We must, it seems to me, make a clear division between the functions of the Union ministry and RSFSR ministry and introduce order.

The question of musical education is a very serious one. We have few people from the Russian provinces. Why? On talking with people I learned of the following reason: The outlying districts live in need, because people go into production, while those who are registered in Moscow and Leningrad engage in music. Music often becomes a family profession in the capitals, with whole families working at it. But there are only a few people from the Russian oblasts. We must study the matter seriously.

**Speech by Ch.T. Aytmatov**

The writer thanked the president for the opportunity given to the bearers of modern culture to gather in the Kremlin.

This meeting is also particularly important because the creative unions are gradually losing their concentrating, collecting role—that is evidently a sign of the times. Unless we communicate and, especially, exchange thoughts, it will be a loss, not a gain, for everyone.

The point is that we are living in a complex, alarming time on the brink of tranquillity. In our historical existence we have somehow moved unnoticed into the present situation and we are now discovering that confusion threatens culture and the existence of our entire multinational state and society as a whole. I support many speeches, for instance those of Bondarev and Shatrov when they try, seemingly from different positions, to consider our present situation but ultimately think about one and the same thing, are concerned for the same thing, and seek with the same desperation ways to somehow save both culture and man and all the assets which we have. I think that one of the most important, paramount tasks now is to preserve our country's multinational unity, its all-Union unity.

It is not a matter of what name we shall give our unity but of ensuring that it is indeed preserved for the benefit of all national cultures, for all of us and for our children and grandchildren.

I often think together with my friends about what is happening in the country, about what will happen next, what will happen to our culture, literature, and art. And with my neighbors in Peredelkino—I meet if only for a minute with Sergey Pavlovich Zalygin and immediately begin talking about this.

I must say that the years of perestroyka have given us a very great deal, have seemed to reveal our potential, but the real political situation has proved so complex that we have produced nothing major in our works. Can we say about literature, the theater, and the cinema: That is to our credit, that is our acquisition, that is our insight? We cannot! We are all now in the grip of a premonition of some new resurrection but this resurrection is becoming increasingly difficult with every passing day because the destruction of the very structure of the state, of the historical environment in which we arose as figures and representatives of culture, is under way. So I want to return to what alarms me most of all. I do not understand the provenance of this ineradicable, constantly growing trend toward division, and that particularly concerns the Russian Federation and Russia as such.

I can understand and justify the Baltic republics when they try to resurrect themselves and establish themselves within a more integral national organ. But Russia cannot be more than it is; Russia is Russia: the force which gathers us all and is our basis, our foundation. We have arisen in these very complex, very difficult years. The entire history which we now speak of as a tragedy—and that is so—yet after all even that tragedy is something we experienced. And now that Russia is trying to fence itself off from others, to stand aloof and be only Russia and nothing else; harm is being caused. I have in mind not you personally but the ideologists of the new Russian idea.

The Russian idea should exist. It should be national and at the same time universal—that is what our past and present dictate to us. I think that Russian culture, Russia as such should not turn so sharply and irreversibly from what has been with it all these years, at this entire historical stage.

National sovereignty is now becoming the talk of the town. Yes, it should triumph, it should have sensible forms and some acquisitions—that is undoubted. But I think that here too there should be criteria, a sensible limit. Just as there exists the concept of the subcontinent I would say that there should exist the concept of subsovereignty. There cannot be absolute sovereignty in the historical organism in which we are now, when everyone is fighting for, everyone is literally intoxicated before the light of, absolute sovereignty. Absolute sovereignty means the complete division of every single thing: the determination of borders, the establishment of diplomatic relations, our own economy, our own money system, our own diplomatic service, and so forth. It seems to me that is an unnecessary and irrational desire, I do not see in this any fruitful phenomenon in the historical sense.

I would like to address my comrades, my brothers in art, so that we may consider this some time, think about it so that Russia may nonetheless remain an organizing center with the power to attract and not a center which fences itself off from one and all. Experiencing concern for culture as such, we must see its duality, because a truly

national culture cannot be an end in itself, cannot be completely isolated, culture must always be universal too. It is essential to see that a national culture is at the same time a universal matter for all those around, for all mankind. It is proceeding from this premise that I think we must address the country's entire creative intelligentsia.

Perhaps this will be an appeal, perhaps it will be a declaration about how we understand our country's new reformation and new allied and federative relations. The document should unite us all in this movement, in the establishment and development of new federative relations, in the desire to preserve culture, Soviet culture, as our common asset. If we were to display this initiative, it would meet with support in our most diverse regions.

I should like to see Russia as a force of nonresistance to its aims. For instance, I cannot understand when people ask where Russia has been so far and why it has only suddenly arisen now. It has always been there! The center is Russia, comrades. And the center and everything else around should be on Russia's platform. But at present the picture is like this: Russia is on its own and the center is something insubstantial. Russia must assume the functions of the center, the structure of the center, and then we will be able to unite together again and to exist together, to feel our society, to feel that we are linked. But so far the picture looks like this: A ship is sailing, it has sprung a leak, and instead of getting rid of the danger and hoisting new sails and a new flag, since we are steering a new course, we are all taking to our little boats and each person is seeking to row away as rapidly as possible.

The creative intelligentsia must at this most crucial period in our fatherland's history think about our fatherland as a single whole. That is why I am in favor of appealing to the creative intelligentsia in connection with the forthcoming new Union treaty.

Next I should like to dwell on a very complex question with which we have already come face to face, so to speak. It is the market and culture. In general, if we approach the matter strictly, these are mutually exclusive things. When it is a case of the market's interests then all the rest no longer has any meaning. In that sense the market is merciless but at the same time it is the economic lever with whose aid we want to resurrect our country. The market is inevitable, a lot is being said about it now. Our parliament and our president are gripped by this thought, this concern, this quest.

But culture is the ultimate goal of any power, people, society, or country in which the constructive, creative forces of the historical medium which exists find expression. Culture cannot flourish and develop on a purely market soil—that is ruled out. Therefore, if we are thinking about our own culture we must—I am addressing our president—find paths, means, reforms, and subsidies to maintain culture as such. Perhaps they will be deductions from all general taxes, some small percentage—I do not know. And there must be a culture foundation. It seems to me that we cannot merely hope for donations, for some subsidies of a purely voluntary nature. They must be used, but that is unreliable, the reliable path consists of a deduction from the overall taxes of the entire country, of all production establishments, from all labor.

I support the speeches which expressed great alarm and anticipation of fear and confusion. Yes, such is history and living reality. Our ideas and notions are one thing: We began perestroyka with a spiritual fire, we welcomed it and support it, but a period has come when democracy is in need of defense and order, of power and the law. So far I see no form in which this force is manifested, a creative force which does not punish pointlessly but which would restrain all these mounting destructive processes. That is why I think the president should have every power to do this. He has these powers, but they must be used. I am sure that here the president will be understood, supported, and approved.

**Speech by K.Yu. Lavrov**

I shall try to be brief because I absolutely agree with a very great deal that has been said here and I do not want to repeat it.

The main thing which perturbs me most of all and gnaws at me constantly is what seems to me to be the continuing decline of the cultural standard of nations and the cultural standard of our country's population.

There are probably many reasons for this but recently, as I was strolling around Leningrad, along paths not trodden by tourists, I suddenly saw a wonderful little outbuilding, obviously built at some time in the first quarter or the middle of the last century. Broken, destroyed, covered in indecent graffiti, it was letting in the rain and the roof was damaged. I approached and read: "Preserved by the state." The former barracks and stables of a guards regiment.... And small children were running around this outbuilding. And it is these small children, having seen all this, who go into a lift and write the same kind of graffiti on the walls, break the lights, and lose any sense of respect and national pride in their people, in themselves, in their parents.

We know terrible facts which attest to the decline of morality. It seems to me that those who have brought the state of our morality to this level are no longer re-educable, they have already lost the internal spiritual, creative need for any changes and believe that all this is normal.

But if we want there to be at least some prospect of restoration, of the boosting of our society's spirituality and morality, then we must begin with the small children who are now growing up. In whose hands are they? They are in the hands of teachers and future university programs. That means that we should probably begin with that link in order to have a slight hope at least within a generation or two of changing at any rate something.

I remember how many sessions I have already attended, how many appeals I have heard, so that an analogy with the fundamental and applied sciences suggests itself. Often forgetting the fundamental sciences, we begin to express our pain, our grief, our problems, and I cannot avoid this since that is the system we have. But in the sense of fundamentalism I feel very close to the position of D.S. Likhachev, whom I respect most deeply, and I share his ideas of a global order. I support the idea of a declaration put forward by Dmitriy Sergeyevich and I am sure this is necessary. In our committee Chingiz Torekulovich and I once put forward the question of making the first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers the first deputy for culture, but it did not work out....

M.S. Gorbachev: But I remember how much effort you had to make—the members of the Supreme Soviet will remember—to prove in general that a minister of culture and a Union ministry were needed. So instead of the dialectic of the national and the international, which in general is real and exists, we are going to extremes. Our country is distinguished by the number of peoples living on this land and each people is distinguished by its language, its written language, literature, indeed its way of life. And when they said: Merge the nations and that is it! This was not only antihumane, it was in general an antinational, antipopular idea. Now, in removing all deformations, we should not embark on national narrowness, autarky, and isolation. That is pernicious in general for any people and any culture.

K.Yu. Lavrov: The issue of the culture of some individual ethnic group or nation being able to exist separately, exclusively, isolated from the world cultural process, is a fiction. It cannot be! And to the honor of our country's theatrical figures I must say that they understand this. And in our Union so far (knock wood, as they say) there is no split. Lithuania has left our Union, but now that we have organized our activity on a treaty basis; Lithuania is the first to have come to us and concluded a treaty.

We now have a structure whereby each republic takes part in those measures which it considers necessary, we impose nothing. You want to take part? We do. It costs so much. And we have good and friendly relations with all republics, there is no confrontation in that sense.

I welcome in every way the creation under the president, under the Presidential Council, of an organ of people who understand art, who are concerned by the general state of culture and the morality and spirituality of art, who must outline and implement a fundamental program for somehow emerging from the terrible situation in which we find ourselves now. Of course, this should be an authoritative organ not only in terms of its composition but also in terms of the influence which it can exert on our current life.

And how we have to work for every kopek! We understand that the state cannot give much to culture: the budget deficit, a mass of other problems. But do not take from us at least what we earn ourselves! Do not stifle us with taxes, then we ourselves will have some opportunity to do something for the development of culture in our country. No, in any case each time the battle is so bloody that sometimes you simply give up and do not want to get involved any more.

One more problem is the drain of brains and talents from our society. We cannot shrug off this problem. I cannot agree with those who say that someone has left and God be with him. Of course, a great deal of scum is leaving in this outflow and let it go, they will not be missed. But how many bright minds are going at the same time! It is draining the nation's blood. That probably means that somehow we must also consider this problem. Thank God that so far people are not leaving our drama theaters: They do not know the language. In general the drama theater is so national, based on popular roots and traditions, that it can only exist here. But it can perform wherever it wants. That is why this problem does not worry us in the theater very much.

Something else does worry us. Once, at some time in the twenties, Moscow was the world's theatrical Mecca, one of the theatrical capitals. Alongside Paris and London, Moscow had an unusually high creative prestige in world theatrical circles. We very much want to resurrect that prestige which has gradually been destroyed over many years and as a result we have reached a rather sorry picture.

Many cities of the world, large and not very large, have their own permanent international theatrical festivals. All that is best in world theatrical practice converges here. The festivals are also a tremendous school and provide an opportunity for theatrical figures to communicate. And if you remember, Mikhail Sergeyevich, you attended our constituent congress in December 1986 and at the time we decided to organize in Moscow a permanent international theatrical festival named for A.P. Chekhov. We believe that a country which has Gogol and Chekhov—I shall not list them all now—needs such a theatrical festival. In 1991 together with the USSR Ministry of Culture we intend to hold the first such festival. We have already compiled the guest list. The greatest figures of world theater have already agreed. The interest in the Soviet theater is unusually high in the world and therefore they are very interested in our cooperation. For instance, Peter Brook and Peter Stein have agreed to come to the Soviet Union.

In this connection I suggest that the CPSU Central Committee act as one of the festival's sponsors—I am speaking seriously. It seems to me this would be a very weighty act supporting the reputation of the CPSU.

**Speech by V.G. Rasputin**

D.S. Likhachev's figurative expression about the bird of culture being released from its cage after having lost its strength and the instinct to feed itself, can be extended: There are no nests left for it, all the nests are simply

occupied by something that can no longer be called culture. Culture itself has become almost anticulture. Aggressive sounds have emerged in music, aggressive images have emerged in art. Aggressive words and aggressive subjects, aggressive positive heroes, and so on have emerged also in literature.

This is actually far removed from culture. Whenever we think of what has happened to our society, we always say that culture must be given greater priority. This must indeed become the main point, the starting point to be used in politics, in the economy, in morality, literally in everything. All our misfortunes stem from culture, or rather from our lack of culture.

No, personal culture in our country is brilliant, it can be said that it has been brilliant all through the last decade, but now it is marking time. As for grassroot culture, the culture of daily life—it is in a simply terrible state. And we can see the result in what is happening in our streets, in our economy, in our souls.

Many problems have been raised. Dmitriy Sergeyevich [Likhachev] is right in what he proposes. The declaration has been pressing for a long time. We need a law on protection of culture. At the same time, we also need a law on protection of morality, because these matters are totally inseparable. Culture must always be moral. There is no such thing as state culture, it is something different that goes by a different name. As for culture—no matter what appropriations might be made available now—it is threatened by a disease that is worse than any plague, the disease of immorality. The remnants of the Komsomol [Communist Youth League] are now busy working on nothing but young people's amusement. Trade unions have also taken this tack in order to earn money. There are 25,000 video theaters—and I think that this estimate does not include the underground ones, where the real filth is shown.

Yesterday I watched our two ministers of culture on television, and I gathered that they intend to tackle this. It is simply no longer possible to go on demoralizing young people. If for no other reason, simply because we have left them to their own devices, young people in our country are altogether on their own. The Supreme Soviet committee is in no position to deal with young people. We have cast them off, and someone is sure to pick them up. "Missionaries" are coming in teaching young people not only businesslike qualities but also much of what is not needed. This can be really dangerous for us.

Many have spoken about publishing youth literature. We need a state program for young people's and children's literature, it is simply necessary. Sergey Vladimirovich Mikhalkov spoke about children's literature, about kid's stuff. I have also dealt with it. Children's books are now in a terrible state. First, because they are cheap. Second, because they never reach the book shelves, they are bought up and right away appear in those selfsame stores at five, six, seven, eight, nine, and even 10 times the original price. This is why it is necessary to give "Detskaya Literatura" and "Malysh" [Kid] an opportunity to sell a proportion of books at contract prices, and leave the rest at their disposal, to deal with them as they see fit and get themselves out of the difficulties. And the next most important point is obviously to ensure that state orders cover 100 percent of children's literature, of literature for young people, and it is necessary to ensure that paper is supplied. And, of course, tax concessions. It is impossible to take the same amount from children's books as, for example, from cooperatives. A program favoring children's books is simply necessary.

We probably also need a law on morality. To speak about censorship now—it would have been dubbed "moral censorship" in the past—would be somehow unseemly. Moral demandingness, maybe? Now it is considered improper to make movies without the "porno element"! People are now debating in the pages of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA—a major U-turn—what is pornography and what is not pornography, what is permissible and what is not permissible in art. I am a university graduate, but I cannot figure out the difference between pornography, eroticism, and indecency. In my view, none of us can figure it out! Nobody can figure it out, and yet they take it upon themselves to ponder, take it upon themselves to issue recommendations as to what can be portrayed in art and how far it is possible to go.

We do have a law on pornography but, you see, it has so many "loopholes" that if we tried to apply this law the result would be simply nothing.

The destruction of morality, the destruction of culture—this is a very serious matter and it must be tackled, no matter how hard this may be.

Nonetheless, the paramount point now is to survive, to withstand. We must figure out everything that is happening. The initiative has been taken out of our hands, it has been captured not by intellectuals but by semi-intellectuals. Matters are actually worse—they did not capture it, they just shoved us aside and now we are... forced to consent.

And the press at times loses its way, it lacks a feeling for the spirit of the times. Enough of destruction, enough of laying on the "black paint"! The time has come when people have had enough of such truth. And how can you talk about truth when there is so much untruth, so many fabrications, so much dirt, so many lies, so much hatred for this country in general pouring out of our newspaper pages! Never mind reading it all, at times one simply wishes to run away as far as possible, and that is all.

There are people who still heed our words, we have not lost all people. If only we would speak out loud about the situation in the country, say that we support the president and that the country cannot be saved without proper order. After all, we are talking about the salvation of perestroyka and the country, including the salvation of Russia. This is the cause for whose sake we have gathered, and have not gathered in vain.

**Speech by D. Khudonazarov**

Let me begin with the words spoken by V.G. Rasputin, who called on all artists to rise above petty differences, to become aware of their position, their responsibility, and their status in the country, and to act as a cementing and consolidating factor, countering destruction.

It seems to me that all this must be done within the framework of setting up a rule-of-law state and a civic society, we cannot achieve this accord without an accord between the different social structures. How many times have we diagnosed the lamentable state of our culture, beginning with Likhachev's first speech at the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, much was said even before that, and for almost two years we have been talking about our disastrous situation.

I think that it would be unseemly to carry on talking about our situation. We must get down to the stage-by-stage implementation of the solution of all problems. In the process of today's conversation, it is necessary to create a consultative council under the president. This council could become the actual mechanism which would regulate mutual relations between different state and social structures. It seems to me that this must be done horizontally, without any upward or downward subordination. The entire and very complex spectrum of solutions to our problems could emerge within this council's framework. It would be frivolous to think that our problems could be solved by a single presidential decree, because life proves that there are no conditions to ensure immediate performance of presidential decrees.

This is an objective factor and we must bear it in mind. This is why various ad hoc commissions could operate within the framework of the consultative committee, the council under the president, to provide expert studies at various levels taking into account analyses and forecasts as to what would happen to various acts of ours and what sort of public support might be needed.

Let me turn back to what V.G. Rasputin said about the fact that we could in many regards offer broad support in the implementation of future presidential decrees, and this applies not only to the solution of cultural problems but to the stabilization of the situation in the country as a whole. It seems to me that we could elaborate policy—the nature of the state program in the sphere of culture and the mutual relations in a common approach at the level of the whole country and its components, because, during the transition period, we must have our own clear-cut concept as regards also the salvation of national cultures, because they all are interlinked. Each question must be resolved at a specific level.

We must also have a response to the market. Cultural policy cannot be adopted and then mothballed forever; it must change constantly depending on what is suggested by life itself.

It is important to establish legal relations between artists and the state, the social production structures, and the citizens, because no matter how much we talk, this is the only way to improve the artist's situation. This is the world practice applied in all countries, and if we did so we would not have to go begging. It seems to me that authors' copyright lies at the core of this program. I think that it is extremely necessary for us to press ahead with what Aleksandr Ivanovich said here about signing the Vienna Convention. Very often, thinking about saving these 10 million, we end up losing much more because the international community and international law do not protect our interests beyond our country's borders. Expert study and analysis are needed.

Very much was said here about a law on the protection of morality. But even a law on the protection of morality is itself associated with authors' copyright, with the legal regulation of mutual relations between artist and society. I think that these problems cannot be examined or solved in isolation, but only comprehensively. Extreme importance attaches to the way society will respond to the implementation of the provisions of a future law on the protection of morality. Here is quite a recent case: A famous director made a movie in America; this movie was rated quite poorly by society, and the company which made it responded instantaneously. The company is distancing itself from the director, because it immediately loses the public's respect. There you have an indication of how important it is to protect our morality, to protect our culture and everything associated with it.

Let me turn back again to the nature of this consultative council. In my view, the "Declaration of Rights for the Protection of Culture" by Dmitriy Sergeyevich contains a very serious article, Article 5, which raises the question that national wealth as a whole also includes museum exhibits, books, and archive material. As leader of the creative Cinematography Workers Union, I am worried by the condition of movies. They are in a terrible state, very many movies have perished, including documentaries and movies made in the twenties, thirties, and forties. It is therefore natural that the fate of movies should not be decided by the ministry or the directors of film archives. I fully and totally support this declaration and especially share the pain for the preservation of our heritage.

I agree with everything that was said about taxation, about the material and technical state of culture and of cinematography in particular, and about everything to do with our mutual relations with foreign countries. The Aeroflot problem, for example. The sale of tickets for foreign currency makes it impossible to welcome visitors. Unless we solve this problem, all cultural links with foreign countries and with foreign cultural figures will be broken.

**Speech by B.S. Ugarov**

In the present state of our country and society we must nonetheless remember concepts like the motherland and

patriotism and from this viewpoint correlate everything we do and say. This is very important because society's degeneration proceeds not only from our economic state but most of all from the fact that we have breaches in the concept of ideology and culture. It is this, it seems to me, which is our most painful spot and in the fire of debates and the defining of positions and of a certain hostility, it happens that we forget that before us is a people who read us and look at us and to whom we give our creation and our energy. And whatever we may do the concept of motherland and the people are our moral bulwark.

We have now started to burst the blood vessels of this concept. That is very terrible, because there is the concept of a socialist culture, a Soviet culture, there is the concept of the Soviet person, and we must in no way repudiate this, wherever we may be going now, whatever aim we are approaching, because this concept exists throughout the world. It was precisely incorporated in the concept of world culture and the world community.

When we came from the war we studied together with boys from all the republics. To this day we cultural workers have no purely national concept, no hostility toward each other. We did a job together but now each republic considers itself a state. I do not know what it is like in other creative unions but among artists, cohesion with regard to the state of culture is intensifying still further. And these people must be helped, culture must be helped. I would put the question directly: We are always at some residual minimum and to boost culture please give us a simple thing: Release us from taxes for five years. We shall boost ourselves at least. You realize that this will be a state policy with regard to the state of culture.

Young people worry me very much. We studied to enter life and help that life. The patriotism which entered our blood enabled us to live with some hope. But young people today are in a state in which they do not know what they exist for. And we are to blame, their fathers are to blame. We were unable to preserve this hope in them.

What else perturbs me? The question of the humanization of science. Dmitriy Sergeyevich very precisely emphasized the question of the state relation to everything, including science. There is the example of France with its academy institution. I do not understand why the Academy of Sciences is higher than the Academy of Medical Sciences, where people are struggling to conquer cancer. And there are people who invent some new things. There cannot be first-rate and second-rate science, and the same applies to art. That principle for creating an academy institution will make it possible to create an academy of the plastic arts, an academy of literature and music, and so forth. It will be a single organism which will help the government, the president, and all soviets.

I want to repeat once more, the artist said in conclusion, that the fate of the present largely depends on us and we must think primarily of the motherland and the people.

**Speech by Yu.B. Solovyev**

I very much go along with what Kirill Yuryevich Lavrov said. I think our poverty, both morally and economically, is to a considerable extent bound up with the people's very low cultural level. Unfortunately, we have done all we can to make this level low. Dmitriy Sergeyevich is absolutely right when he says that labor culture (I would say the culture of everyday life as well) is to a considerable extent determined by the human environment. We have spent 70 years making monstrosities that have spoiled the population's artistic taste. And if today I tell a worker: "Make something beautiful," he does not understand what I am talking about. He thinks that in the end he has to make something reliable, but why beautiful?

Yesterday I looked at the work of our Grabar workshops. There are some splendid specialists working there. But you should see how they look calmly on as workers do the wiring in magnificent buildings by Shchusev, in church buildings.

I have not seen a single room—from machine operator's workplace to minister's office—that fosters artistic taste. And when I talk with a minister or with an engineer about having to make something that is convenient to use he does not understand. We are living in difficult times and it is terrible to think that when this time is past we will still be producing export products the West will laugh at. Indeed, it is quite different over there. There they endeavor to make things that are convenient and beautiful, and they have the artistic culture to do it, absorbed with their mother's milk. But we do not do this, we do not educate our children. In fact, artistic education begins with the first cup a child sees, with toys.... They know this in the West and they start education with artistic education at school. We have few of them [as published]. They produce specialist designers there, we have none. And when we decide, after this difficult time, that we want to sell something, we will find our products are uncompetitive.

We have already lost the 20th century, because there is not enough time left to instill artistic taste. It will take at least 10 years to educate the designers we lack. We must think about the 21st century and we must start today with preschool education and raise cultivated people who, once we have gotten through the difficult time, will save our country in the 21st century.

**Speech by Yu.V. Nikulin**

I was very anxious on my way here and I became even more worried when I heard the speeches. I was not intending to speak, but I got so agitated, frightened even. I got a shock yesterday evening when I saw on "Vremya" tens of thousands of freightcars waiting at the border, filled with imported goods which have not reached us for months. And I thought: Good God, what is happening!

I used to be happy: With glasnost we will know everything, and knowledge is important to people. But there is

glasnost they certainly need not show. Why show this on television? Are we supposed to help? Am I, a circus director, supposed to go and unload the freightcars? Let them give the data to the government and to the Supreme Soviet deputies; let them read and think about them. We only get frightened. It is as if all the magazines have come to an arrangement as to who should frighten whom the most. They are inventing terrible things, it is all very mysterious.

M.S. Gorbachev: Yuriy Vladimirovich, the subscription period is nearly up, so they are trying hard.

Of course, Kirill Lavrov's was the best speech, the speaker went on. He was right: Why do they all only see the bad things, starting with the freightcars? It is our lack of culture, our lack of education. In fact, goodness is not instilled in us. Incidentally, a Leningrader recently asked me what I thought of the "500 days" program. I am glad it is not 900 days, I replied!

Every cook either praises his own broth or cries over it. I want to talk about an art that some regard as the lowest of the low; there is always talk about the theater, the movies, and painting, but they do not write about the circus. But the circus is art: art belonging to the masses, to the people. What horrifies us is the fact that thousands of the best artists left our system as soon as the cooperatives opened up. They make for the cooperatives like moths to a flame, and their ambition is to go over there, abroad, to America. Bim-Bom [the circus] just sat there and they all bought a piece of him....

Now the republics are autonomous and they have decided to take the circuses over as well. The circus is ours, we do what we like with it. R10 a ticket!

The circus is declining, the circus is going downhill. An artist's average pay is R180-190. Yet the people take risks every day. Thirty performances a month. What theater would have that kind of schedule! And they are risking their lives! It shocked me.

On 1 October our circus will be the first to switch to the lease system. How difficult it was to get out! What a fuss, what an uproar! Thank you Ministry of Culture for supporting us!

It is going to be a celebration for me. The executive committee registers us on 3 October. We will now be entitled to set our own pay rates. I will have fewer people working for me, but they will be the people we really need. We will know that everything is ours and we will perform accordingly.

I have faith in our conference, I have faith in you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, faith that something will change. And there is no need to envy the Germans for having 30,000 choirs. When everything is OK here, when we are fed and clothed, you can imagine how everyone will be bursting into song!

Mikhail Sergeyevich, you have presidential powers. Help us! Help culture—and you will be remembered by our grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

**Speech by M.A. Ulyanov**

I have listened closely to the outstanding people of our culture, who are well aware what is happening here and have said many splendid things that are absolutely true, but I think there are other things that are more difficult to talk about: How can we prevent a bloodbath? Culture alone cannot do it, but it cannot be done without culture. I think we must now talk about preventing hunger riots. They are coming. It is a curse that strikes at the heart. We have made some suggestions here: If culture is freed from taxes, which I am all for, everything will be settled immediately. No, my dear compatriots, there is more to it than that. I think that before we talk about culture we must make every effort to prevent extremists, strong individuals with hard fists and plenty of energy, from clambering onto the captain's bridge. We must tackle this first and give our president every assistance in this area. Because all our talk is mere intellectual prattle unless these problems are solved.

We must decide—and the people are waiting—what shore we are going to end up on and we must make the transition to the market. We are in the middle, there is no going back, there is still a long way to sail, but sail we must. The people are in a state of confusion at the moment and they need to be shown the way. There is nothing new in human relations apart from the individual's having a stake in something and being free to express himself. Let a man know that when he takes on two hectares of land no one will take them away from him.

There is much talk about culture at the moment. But if you travel around you see a strange situation: The roads leading into Moscow are more neglected than in any other city. Because people do not have that sense of owning something. All the garbage in Moscow and Leningrad did not appear overnight either. The peasant in the Russia of old did not watch television and did not read Dostoyevskiy, but he did have moral principles which he did not dare break; and these principles were laid down by the Church, by the whole tenor of life.

Now anything is possible. How are we going to restore it now? By making appeals? I do not believe so. I do not believe that declarations by and the signatures of all the people's artists and all the academicians would do it. It is the conditions of life that make people. Are Western workers better than ours? No. But Western workers are better paid and have a stake in their labor, so production standards are much higher there. Our workers are not frightened of losing their jobs and are not frightened of being sworn at for doing a bad job. Basically, they are not interested, and this means that standards go out of the window.

A "McDonalds" opened in Moscow. One cannot imagine a bigger slap in the face for our society. In the

center of the capital people are lining up from 0930 until 2130. A massive crowd. People are still standing there in the cold and the rain. But not only do they stand there, they arrive in droves. Then the frantic pushing and shoving starts. What culture is it that fights for a miserable bun! In Argentina I saw "McDonalds" restaurants all over the place and there was no one in them; we have one, and that is in the center of Moscow. It is sad, it is bad, it is tragic.

M.S. Gorbachev: "McDonalds" is not to blame.

The speaker then gave his opinion on the tax system.

The Russian Theater Workers' Union, he said, is using the money it earns to help actors, paying them pensions and giving them social protection. At the last session we all but pleaded with them not to take the money off us, otherwise everything would collapse: the entire Union and all unions. Who needs taxes which cause actors, artists, and writers to stop working. It is a shortsighted policy that I do not really understand. There is no benefit to the state because there are so few of us to tax.

**Speech by B.I. Oleynik**

I want to urge you to help the president to impose a moratorium on research into how ancient or young peoples are, if only until a commission headed by the president comes into operation and we arrive at a definition of what kind of common home we want to build. I do not want to criticize anyone, the writer said, but nationalist careerists will exploit any careless word and make the most of it. You know how skillfully it can be done, after all there have always been speculators, and now they are in the higher reaches and are accelerating toward a bloody clash. Therefore, I absolutely agree with Dimitriy Sergeyevich Likhachev, Boris Sergeyevich Ugarov, and Mikhail Aleksandrovich Ulyanov that there is a point beyond which we must not go.

I will now move the spotlight to another problem that has been mentioned here. We are unique people; it happens once in a thousand years. There are people still with us who were born in the 19th century, there are people who were born and bred in the 20th century, and people are being born who will be citizens of the 21st century. So three centuries meet at a single point. We are witnessing the end of a century and of a millennium. What is someone who fought for our homeland, who is hobbling around on crutches in his declining years, going to think when he finds out that it has now been decided to cancel a holday that is seen as a national holiday. It makes his whole life meaningless. Look at the way some mouthpieces of glasnost regard our front-line veterans. Nowhere else in the world is there such a disparaging, belittling, and even hostile attitude toward the people who defended us.

Some people are attacking the graves of people who fell on the battlefields of the Great Patriotic War and destroying the gravestones. Let us be precise about this—this is not just uncivilized, it is a policy being pursued by certain circles who are thrusting the children and grandchildren of dead and still living front-line soldiers toward a second moral execution. They have already been subjected to this execution. This second moral execution—and we must use a precise term to define this—is a call for moral patricide. It is a sin subject to no mere earthly judgment.

**Speech by I.A. Antonova**

It is my guess that it is not so often that a museum worker's voice is heard here, and I very much appreciate the opportunity to say a few words about our museum in the context being aired here today. In all civilized countries museums rank among the fundamental, leading, main cultural institutions. Today's museum is a temple, a forum, an institute, a theater, a school where people are educated. Unfortunately the situation in the museum business in our country is very difficult, and in some respects very shameful. No new museums have been built in the country for decades. The material and technical base of existing ones is terrible, and many are not being modernized but have simply been closed down because they can no longer survive. There are no storage facilities or equipment, and the most elementary parameters linked with ensuring the necessary climate for monuments of culture and art are not observed. This is of course the result of neglect and misapprehension of what a museum or library is and what they mean for culture in our country.

Museum workers are in a very difficult material position. Figures of R700 and R500 have been mentioned here. Ours is a museum with Union status. Our average wage is R122. In these conditions how is it possible to retain cadres? We have recently been losing highly skilled workers since the possibility of joining cooperatives and all kinds of joint enterprises has emerged. I know that these processes are also occurring in other museums too. Yet ours is a Union museum and ranks among the highest paid.

There has been talk here, in particular, about the declaration proposed by Dmitriy Sergeyevich [Likhachev] that our enterprises must be urged to assist cultural establishments through sponsorship. To some extent this is feasible. But it is not the crucial factor. It is self-evident that the maintenance of culture, museums, and libraries must be a matter for the state. Here we have to be talking about not just one percent but, as we have now reached such an extreme point of decline, at least 15-20 percent. The money must be found somehow. Otherwise in a while there will simply be nothing to preserve and nobody to preserve it.

We museum workers have started traveling more; we have the opportunity to make comparisons. Take France. In the last 10 years they have built three enormous museums there—two new ones and one totally modernized. An industry center has also been opened. And all this within a very short space of time. Subsidies

may be subsidies, but of course there has to be state funding and immediate thought needs to be given to this.

Let me be frank: I was horrified by some of the speeches at the Supreme Soviet session. Even in the Culture and Art Commission people sometimes say that it is immoral to think about giving more to culture when the people are not properly fed.

I remember how 20 years ago I went to the Ministry of Culture and said: The roof is leaking, please help! They replied: What is the matter with you, do you not know what problems there are? People have no housing, no nothing. It is not your turn yet. And how much longer is this going to go on? I think it should be recognized, first and foremost by the Supreme Soviet deputies. This should be discussed all the time, and funds should be sought for culture. Funds must be found. How and from where these contributions are to obtained, is not for me to decide. But the fact that this problem must be resolved without delay is quite obvious.

Another question connected with the preservation of our artistic heritage. There are a large number of personal collections in our country. Many cultural monuments remain in the ownership of the heirs after the death of the collector or artist. We have no legal protection of this property on behalf of the state. Once again I must cite foreign illustrations. In 1968 President Pompidou signed a law in Paris whereby heirs are obliged to hand over an enormous percentage to the state and only retain a very small part for themselves. Or if they want to keep the entire legacy, they have to buy it back. But in practice that is unrealistic. The legacy of Picasso or Chagall means billions for the state on the basis of the law. It is the right of the state to dispose of this legacy first and foremost in its own interests. There is a special commission which selects the best items. Museums are set up on this basis. Picasso and Chagall museums were set up in this way.... Here, all this is usually squandered. And at the moment the situation is absolutely terrible, because heirs have been given the opportunity to sell valuables abroad. Not one of them wants to sell what belongs to him, even to us, the museum, for big money. Incidentally, the ministry gives us this money for purchases. But the heirs do not want to sell for rubles. And they take the monuments abroad, through Sotheby's auctions and various other channels. It seems to me that the adoption of a law on the artistic heritage and the state's right to it is absolutely necessary.

Much has been quite rightly said here about culture, about spiritual and moral values, and about the disastrous state of spiritual and moral life. Allow me to say something that has not yet been said, taking advantage of the fact that there are a great many people here who are responsible for various sectors of culture and art. Perestroyka has done much to make us value and recognize our 20th-century heritage: artists, philosophers, writers, poets, musicians. It is remarkable that all this vast, precious cultural stratum of our time has become accessible to us. But at the same time a kind of alienation, you could say, of the classical heritage is taking place. We pay too little attention to it. There is hardly anything on television. The plays of the great dramatists have stopped being put on in the theaters.

You know, a whole generation is now growing up that does not know what the classical heritage is, what wealth we possess. Whether Western or our own, Russian or non-Russian, you name it. The classics, which are, in fact, the "gold reserve" of morality, beauty, culture, and conscience, must be brought to the attention of our children, and not only the children, but those who teach them and their parents. Because several generations are already living outside this cultural environment. They do not know it.

Forgive me, but I would like to touch on a rather delicate question. Do the cultural figures present here not think that in attempting to talk about the foundations of the moral rebirth of our people, we overemphasize and exaggerate, through television and the mass media, the influence of religious thinking? So as not to be misunderstood, I will say that Rakhmaninov's "All-Night Vigil" ["Vsenoshchnaya"] has been heard in our schools for the first time. I regard with enormous respect and understanding the restoration of laws for religion and for the church in our country. But all the same, trying to say that the church alone, religion alone, take priority over morality, conscience, and all the lofty spiritual and moral aspects of our life is certainly wrong. I think there is a certain distortion here, a degree of overemphasis of this topic. All of us, of course, must think about all this a great deal more, because the vast experience of philosophical thought, culture, and art is a very important foundation for people's moral education, and it seems to me that the importance of religious thinking should not be exaggerated.

And another question that has been touched on—the problem of the destruction of monuments. For me this is perhaps the most acute sign of degeneration, of some kind of fall. I am ashamed for a nation, for people who raise their hands against, say, monuments to Lenin, monuments to Patriotic War heroes, monuments in general. I was very upset, for instance, about the renaming of the Gorkiy Moscow Arts Theater with the great name of Chekhov. How could they change Gorkiy's name? What for? That is an example of an immoral approach to our own history, to the historical environment in which we live.

Now, unfortunately, it is proposed to remove Pushkin's name from our museum. How can that be—to remove Pushkin's name? Who would do such a thing?

In France they had Robespierre and Napoleon. Nonetheless monuments to those people still stand. It is the historical environment of the historical past in which people live. I am no Stalinist, but in France there is a Stalingrad Avenue, and they are not going to rename it, because this avenue was named in honor of a certain historical event which took palce, and so on, and so

forth. In all this frenzy for changing names and knocking things down, it seems to me, we should retain some feeling and dignity and some kind of historical self-awareness.

**Speech by R.A. Bykov**

I want to draw an analogy between the situation in ancient Novgorod and the current situation in the country. It seems that all the things which are now beginning in our country existed at that time. You had authority wielded by the vaivodes [military governors], authority wielded by every professional guild, authority wielded in every street and alley. As the head of a children's center, I come up against the rayon and the city. Everything has to be coordinated and coordinated over and over. The administration is growing simply in parallel to and directly proportional to the development of our democracy. People are asking: "Did you only coordinate this with that office? Did you get others' agreement on it?" All this may end up with a local neighborhood parliament and, as it were, all the other leading democratic organs.

What is this, then? This is democracy in the absence of culture. It is medieval democracy where you also had the veche [council] in addition to all other sources of authority. Democracy in our country is a question of who shouts loudest, who pays someone else most, who drinks most. It is the problem of relations between culture and democracy.

There is the concept of culture and power. In Russia power was always above the law. Hence the dream of the good tsar. Hence to this day we have the dream of the good obkom [oblast party committee] secretary and the good ispolkom [soviet executive committee] chairman, hopes are pinned on them. All the same when we talk about power and culture, we are talking of a time when the law is above power.

The reason that I support presidential power so vigorously today is because I believe that there is no other way. It is laughable to say that the republics must abandon their attempts to gain sovereignty. This cannot be. This is an organic part of the democratization of our society. But self-government must not develop into arbitrary rule. We are, after all, children of the old times and are entering the new time with all the old baggage. After all, when people made cars, they made them the shape of coaches, and when they made steamships they made them the shape of sailing vessels. Now that we are coming to democracy, we are doing so in the Stalinist mold. Because we conceive of democracy like this: Not every person is a free individual, but every person is a chief. That is the kind of democracy we have. That is why today when republic sovereignty is developing, I think that we are late in adopting one decree—namely, a presidential decree. It is a decree on which the union of all republics can be based—a decree on the sovereignty of the individual. A presidential decree on the sovereignty of the individual irrespective of the republic in which this individual lives, his nationality, or the region, proclaiming that the individual must not be slighted for any reason. Russians living in Estonia must not be slighted, nor Russians living in Uzbekistan, nor any single nation. The president represents the position of the entire Union. What is the USSR? It is each and every individual taken together. I see this decree on sovereignty of the individual as a most important turnaround in defining the culture of society, because this is culture. This is the cult of kindness, humanity, and morality. This would constitute a shift toward culture primarily.

The speaker then dwelt on the problem of the transition to the market in the context of culture. In moving toward the market today, he said, we are, as it were, crossing a road which Russian culture has never crossed. In this connection he deems it necessary to have a program for the preservation of culture—national culture with its national traditions—in tandem with, for instance, the Shatalin program.

When we speak about culture, we are primarily referring to children, R.A. Bykov continued. The program must include the question of our existing assets and things that have become ossified. Take the pioneer houses, for instance—some do wonderful work, but some are quite bad. The life of pioneer houses must lose its formalism. It must lose its formalism, because there always normatives there. A pioneer house teacher's wages are increased, apparently, depending on the number of people whom he teaches. Hence a choir is a good thing, but a drama circle is bad. Lifeless organisms must be revived.

Last, children's cinema... I sent you a letter, Mikhail Sergeyevich, I know your viewpoint, and expect great assistance from you. I do all the same want to say that the center of which I am now in charge has shown not just one premiere but five in succession. We show them in the movie theater which goes by the splendid name of the Children's Central Movie Theater. However, the movie theater is housed in a terribly run-down building. It was the first children's movie theater at one time. It was thought that there would be a second and a third.... It was the best movie theater in Moscow.

We now need to build a movie theater for children, a multiplex theater, and I think that we will do this. I think that a great deal of money is being spent to no avail. There is a great deal of dead money, dead publications, and dead establishments. They must also be revived; this is a whole avenue in the development of our culture.

**Speech by A.V. Vasnetsov**

Culture is not only art, it is not a means of propaganda, it is not a means of entertainment. It is an instrument of unity, a system of communications saving society from disintegration. It is the cement of this unity. For that reason I attach particular significance to culture, without it, in my view, further destruction is inevitable. What instruments of this destruction currently exist?

First: We realize that everything must be razed to the ground first and then... But this "then" has not materialized. I think that the spirit of destruction is being cultivated, a spirit that may start a fire, overturn a car, or smash glass. It may destroy a monument to Lenin, destroy a monument to Shota Rustaveli, destroy an ancient church, rebuild an old city—Mozhaysk, for instance—in a new form. That is also the spirit of destruction. In Moscow and other places we have plowed up a vast number of cemeteries, and we complain that our soldiers' tombs are being destroyed. I find this very painful, I myself fought in the war. Cultural personnel and all people must combat this, Mikhail Sergeyevich. Nothing will happen in this case without the use of power. I must say that any destruction of any monument is a criminal offense. It is destruction of our memory.

Second is commerce. Commerce destroys art. The market is inevitable, we must approach it somehow. But the market in its original form was the undoing of Rembrandt and Van Gogh. It promoted commercial art, rather than the lofty art of lofty individuals. These individuals were unacceptable for the market, it swept them aside. That is what it is doing now too. For that reason some defense mechanisms have to be sorted out to counter those forms of art that the market is eliciting in our country. I repeat, it is inevitable, I realize this, we cannot stand still, we must move on to market relations. But culture must be protected against adverse phenomena. Without fail. I am afraid that if we put everything on a commercial footing, tomorrow there will be no Tretyakov Gallery, no Russian Museum, no Pushkin Museum, just wall-to-wall Arbat. I am not against the Arbat, but I think that it would be monstrous if it were everywhere. And that is where we are heading.

The speaker then voiced his perplexity in connection with the television showing of the destruction of the monuments to Lenin. To show the whole country dreadful shots of Lenin with a rope around his neck. You understand, decapitated—why show it?

As we are talking about commerce, I would like to draw your attention to a particular question. People here have already said that we are not ready for the impending taxes. The conditions for commercial existence are causing us considerable difficulties, and what is more, the concessions which we were promised have in fact proved to be so surrounded by all types of barriers that they are not operational. We are still unable to understand and prepare for the market. Taxes on culture must be lifted at least for five years, to ensure that we do not collapse.... I think that you as president, Mikhail Sergeyevich, could do this.

Last, I support presidential power because we have no other way out and this is our last hope.

**M.S. Gorbachev: Civic Accord [grazhdanskoye soglasiye] Is the Alternative to Confrontation.**

I want to express my deep satisfaction with the very fact of this meeting, M.S. Gorbachev said in conclusion. I have received an important buttress for myself personally today.

I think that idleness, anarchy, and losses start as soon as people become disarmed spiritually. Where there is panic, no work is done. The main thing now therefore is to stabilize society.

Our discussion deserves serious deliberation. It has been permeated with anxiety, responsibility, and, what is specially important, constructiveness. I have had many meetings, including meetings with representatives of the scientific and creative intelligentia. This has been one of the most productive. I rate very highly the desire shown here to pool the efforts of the intelligentsia, all people, the republics, and the whole of society. Your words in favor of this are indispensable.

M.S. Gorbachev then went on to stress that the situation in the country contains both enormous positive potential and great dangers, which are already beginning to be felt. The organs of power and management are lagging behind. Events are approaching more quickly than could have been foreseen. There are signs of movement toward chaos and anarchy. To wait until all this assumes its finished form, so to speak, is irresponsible and impermissible. The tasks of all state and public institutions are to make use of the available opportunities and halt the negative processes. In this regard I think the same way as you do. Even your most harsh judgments have stemmed from a desire to strengthen and support the positive things that have been achieved in recent years and not at all to renounce the great work that has been launched. It is necessary to retain the policy of perestroyka and keep it within bounds, to channel it, in a good sense—by developing the political process, increasing political awareness, and achieving better work organization. I am convinced that it is necessary to master the situation and channel it constructively while it is still not too late.

In this hour of trial—there is no need to fear such words—we need accord in society. Of course, there are forces and certain tendencies with which we will never reconcile ourselves. But on the whole, despite all the diversity of opinions and positions, an appreciation of common responsibility in today's critical situation is essential. Much will depend—I believe that the intelligentsia is aware of this—on the way we act during this period. Otherwise, all the spiritual and moral gains produced by the emancipation of thought and energy and the freedom to create will be lost and the prospects for our development thereby jeopardized.

Civic accord is the alternative to confrontation, of which civil war is the extreme degree. It is also the alternative to a totalitarian regimented system. If we pursue the line of profound confrontation and, as has occurred in Russia, seek to reduce our opponent to a soggy mess, that

would be precisely to return to such a regimented system. Both are a tragedy whose recurrence the country and people will not survive. They will not survive a large-scale civil conflict which would split society. This cannot be permitted. Here everything must be brought to bear: power, culture, and wise words.

I have to say that feelings of panic have been exhibited in various strata of society recently. And we witness a coincidence: People are being intimidated by talk of conspiracy from both left and right. I believe the press has also aided and abetted a great deal here by many irresponsible statements. In this situation the words of the most prominent figures in our culture are very important. They can provide the people with a spiritual buttress.

I am certain that the idea of a civic accord is not farfetched. It is dictated by the fact that we are on the verge of switching to the market and that we are occupied by an unusually difficult problem today—which everyone has spoken about here—of preparing a union-wide treaty on whose basis our Union is to be reformed. We submit the civic accord as a political idea and watchword, and do so for the sake of the future.

I want to resolutely support the idea of the "mustering" role of culture expressed here. Essentially everyone has spoken of this in some way or another, while the actual expression was used by Ch. Aytmatov. Indeed, the lessons of our revolution and the sharp social transformations demand that cultural, legal, and moral checks be placed on the upsurge of destructive, "diabolic" forces which are making themselves felt in our society.

Culture is least of all subject to disintegration, it is maintained in traditions, the memory, and the link between generations. The stability of our society also depends on it to an enormous extent. All this resides in the people themselves; here is the main source of stability.

At the same time I agree with M. Ulyanov and other comrades who have said that culture cannot cope on its own in the present situation. I share your opinion particularly as it is voiced by responsible people who are far from urging the creation of some kind of junta. The country needs stability—political, legal, and economic; order and effective institutions of power are required.

I express my gratitude for your support for the president's efforts and for wanting to fortify his spirit. You are probably no longer in any doubt that this president is not the stuff of dictators. But the need for resolute action has now arisen. We cannot change ourselves without changing our former institutions. The president needs to find a method and modus operandi to support everything vital which is taking place in various strata of society and at the level of republics while ensuring law and order. That is a difficult and diverse phenomenon.

I hope that the president's actions will be supported and meet with understanding at local level. It will also be necessary now to quickly find and complement the institution of the presidency with new organizational forms. It is very important, for example, that N. Gubenko and Yu. Solomin, as has been said here, find new forms of cooperation to make progress. This should now be present in all Union structures in order that the republics feel that the center is changing and is open to cooperation with them. It is not easy to overcome the negative attitude toward the center, although the center is no longer what it was in the past. Trust in it must arise, and that will happen only when there is an awareness that this center is ours, we shaped it—be it the parliament and government or the center on questions of culture, where we all find ourselves again. That indeed is what is needed.

And, of course, it may be necessary in some places to take tough administrative measures where the situation so dictates and where nonacceptance of these measures could have serious consequences. In short, it is necessary to use power, but to use it wisely and responsibly while maintaiing the main thrust of perestroyka.

Answering the meeting's participants' anxious questions connected with the harvesting, M.S. Gorbachev said:

You have precise information—the harvesting is in a state of emergency. I can say that now much has already been done. A decree has been adopted and sent to all republics whereby people, equipment, and resources can be mobilized independently of organizations' jurisdiction in order to bring in the ready harvest. Students, schoolchildren, and the Army have been involved as much as possible. Incidentally, there are more military personnel than usual around Moscow too. As a result of which they, as you know, have ended up as "conspirators." In short, I stress: We are doing everything to ensure that potatoes, cabbages, carrots, and sugar beets are brought in from the fields.

In very heavy weather conditions equipment stops. And the potato harvest is low. A particularly difficult situation is developing at major industrial centers.

An operations group headed by L.A. Voronin and Ye.S. Stroyev has now been set up on my instructions. It is working on questions of supplying food to Moscow, Leningrad, and industrial centers such as Sverdlovsk, Chelyabinsk, and others. We are making purchases of potatoes abroad.

You all know how difficult it is for the new soviets to get on their feet. Regarding Moscow, I was forced to ask Yu.A. Prokofyev—I spoke about it at the session—to assemble the Communist leaders at the gorkom [city party committee] to urge them to do everything necessary to rectify the matter.

Those comrades are right who say that—aside from bad management—sabotaging, speculative forces are causing a colossal loss: They are creating artificial shortages, turning pockets inside out, inflating demand. In the next few days we will take additional measures to combat

speculation. The work of the Prosecutor's Office and the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] must be stepped up considerably. In a word, we will urgently seek the normalization of the situation in the country.

Returning to the meeting's theme, M.S. Gorbachev supported the speakers' proposals on considerably increasing attention to problems of the moral and aesthetic education of children and young people. Mention was also made of creating the legal guarantees and economic conditions for the safekeeping of the USSR peoples' historical and cultural heritage, and of developing professional art and amateur creative activity.

During the meeting there was discussion of questions connected with joint actions by the organs of power and the creative intelligentsia to protect spiritual values against moral corrosion and the price that has to be paid for commercialization, and also in the interests of the humanization of all levels of education, the development of literature, music, the theater, motion pictures, and fine art, and the mutual enrichment of the cultures of the country's peoples.

## Economic

### Gorbachev Decree on Devaluation Expected 'Soon'

*LD0610161390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1937 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[INTERFAX report from the "Vid" program]

[Text] It is expected that a decree from the president of the USSR on the devaluation of the ruble will be issued soon. The draft decree, which was authored by the USSR Ministry of Finance and the State External Economic Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers, was handed to Mikhail Gorbachev on 3 October. The possibility of the forthcoming devaluation of the ruble was confirmed by Stanislav Assekritov, deputy chairman of the State Commission for Economic Reform. He said that a realistic rate for the Soviet ruble would be established no later than January 1991. Our strategic line, Stanislav Assekritov said, is a normal, civilized rate of exchange for the ruble. According to Assekritov, the devaluation will be announced in advance.

### News Conference Held on Gorbachev Economic Decree

#### Petrkov, Abalkin Explain Decree

*LD0510203490 Moscow TASS in English 1957 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[By TASS correspondents Lev Aksenov and Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow October 5 TASS—On August 4 [as received] President Mikhail Gorbachev issued a decree "on high priority measures for the transfer to market relations", a move that Presidential Aide for Economic Affairs Nikolay Petrakov described as a move from mere words to action.

He was speaking at a joint news conference with deputy prime minister Leonid Abalkin devoted to the latest presidential decree.

Abalkin noted that the decree concerned the market's key problem, that of pricing, above all wholesale pricing. He said the decree marked a major step in waiving administrative pricing of technical goods and towards agreed, contract prices.

It is expected, Abalkin said, that economic relations in 1991 will be based on respective agreements on terms and volumes of supplies and prices for products.

According to Abalkin, a list of prices has been compiled to provide initial reference points for such agreements. There are industries, he pointed out, which call for preserving prices at their current level.

He said about 70 percent of all prices will be established by contract, and 30 percent will be fixed centrally. In order to maintain a balance between the town and the country, for instance, the centre will decree stable prices for some machinery, equipment and energy resources.

Petrakov described the presidential decree as "a decisive practical step towards a market-based economy". He said it was necessary to create a competitive market because in a market-oriented economy pricing should take place under competition.

Responding to questions from journalists, Petrakov said that a draft presidential decree has been drawn up to change the rouble's commercial exchange rate used by Soviet enterprises. The draft decree, he said, is now being considered by the leaderships of Soviet republics prior to its signing by the president.

Abalkin said the most delicate question was that of retail prices. Speaking about the terms for the solution of this problem, he noted that two ways were being considered—retail price rises by administrative ordinances and the gradual relaxation of controls on them.

"The decision has not yet been made," he said and noted that this "very responsible step" could not be put off indefinitely, despite its complexity and unpopularity.

Commenting on the preparation of a single plan for the transition to a market-based economy, Abalkin called upon the media not to present the issue as a gladiator battle.

"We are all equally concerned about the fate of the country and the people and are looking for solutions that would be most effective and least painful for the population," he said.

Abalkin told the news conference that an anti-monopoly committee would be set up within the framework of the

transition to the market and the creation of respective new structures in the Soviet Union.

### Abalkin's Remarks Detailed

*LD0510231490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Remarks by Deputy Premier Leonid Abalkin at a news conference in Moscow on 5 October; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] A news conference took place in Moscow on the decree of the USSR president on immediate measures for the transition to market relations. [passage omitted]

[Abalkin] I want to implore you, all who write about this theme, not to make it a battle of gladiators: who conquered, who is the conquered, to apply to it terms used in a sporting contest. We think to an equal degree only about the fate of the country and of the people, about finding the most effective solution and the least painful one for the population. And, of course, we will try as far as possible to bring the taxation conditions closer together because the general principle which is professed in all programs is the creation of equal conditions. One should not differentiate artificially, let us say, the taxation rates for enterprises of different forms of ownership, state, cooperative, share-hold, lease-hold, and so forth. One must endeavor to place them in equal conditions, to give them the opportunity as far as possible to compete and to argue, and not to create artificial support for any of these types of enterprises. [video shows Abalkin seated addressing reporters]

### Gorbachev, Advisers Discuss Market Reform Draft

*LD0710185590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Within the context of preparing a draft program for the transition to the market, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev today met scientists and specialists who are participating in that work. Comrades Aganbegyan, Sitaryan, Yavlinskiy, Pavlov, and Abalkin voiced their ideas. The president defined aspects of the draft program to undergo final revision, taking account of proposals that have been received from the USSR Supreme Soviet and Union of Autonomous Republics, and of the results of meetings with managers of enterprises, workers and peasants, and public representatives. It is intended to hold consultations on these issues with committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, leaders of the Union republics, and with representatives of trade union organizations and public movements.

### Oil Association Threatens Work Stoppage 20 Oct

*LD0610092990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] A delegation of the 80,000-strong collective of the Nizhnevartovsk Oil and Gas Production Association [Nizhnevartovskneftegaz] has contacted the editorial board of the newspaper TRUD. The members of the middle-management council of the oilmen and drilling teams brought an appeal addressed to Comrades Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, Yeltsin and Silayev.

The document says that if the oilmen's demands are not met, oil extraction will stop at many of the association's drilling sites and oilfields beginning 20 October.

What then, are the demands? The oil workers consider it necessary to leave a greater proportion of the profits with the enterprises. At present, 97 kopeks from every ruble earned are deducted and transferred to the centralized funds of the ministry and to the state budget. There is another solution. At the moment, the association sells one tonne of oil to the state for 23 rubles. But, in the world market, it quotes a price of $120 tonne, and today the price even reaches $230 a tonne.

The money that the oil workers hope to receive will certainly not be used just to increase wages. The additional resources are needed to acquire equipment and replace pipelines. The members of the delegation said the Nizhevartovsk Association is now on the brink of disaster. The equipment is unserviceable. Yet enterprise staff are held liable for polluting the environment and for accidents. There are 26 criminal cases now pending.

## Scientific

### Update on Cosmonauts' Continuing Experiments

*LD0910131690 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 9 Oct 90*

[Text] Moscow October 9 TASS—Work onboard the Mir space complex began today with technical experiments and geophysical reasearch.

On October 8, Cosmonauts Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov began a 270-hour experiment to grow crystals of semiconductor gallium arsenide on the technological installation Krater-V.

In accordance with the flight programme, they are continuing experiments to assess the influence of open space on various structural materials, which might be used in future space equipment.

After carrying out scheduled prophylactic work with the primary circuit of the station heating, the crew began to replace the secondary thermal regulation circuit.

On Tuesday, Manakov and Strekalov are photographing the districts near Kharkov and Volgograd and the Aral

Sea with the help of video spectral equipment installed in the hydrostablised platform of the Kvant-2 module.

In order to obtain high quality photographs, the cosmonauts are using the Priroda-5 photographic complex and the KAP-350 topograhpic camera.

According to telemetric information and reports from the crew, all systems on board are functioning normally.

### Expedition To Monitor Black Sea Pollution

*PM0510160190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Oct 90*

[Report by S. Fateyev; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] An international scientific expedition, Black Sea-90, set off from Odessa today.

[Fateyev] The Black Sea is sick, very seriously sick. Scientists are talking with alarm about the sharp increase of concentrations of noxious substances and hydrogen sulfide in the water. This summer, zero oxygen saturation was registered for the first time in the water in Odessa Bay. The highly dangerous so-called gribnevik ["grib" means fungus] has also appeared here. It has been brought in from other seas and has already killed off the Azov Sea. Only a joint effort will make it possible to save the Black Sea. Therefore the present international ecological expedition Black Sea-90 is the main action this year of the International Ecoforum for Peace, which comprises scientists from 22 countries. [video shows Black Sea, research ship Akademik Vernadskiy, ships in background] [passage omitted]

## Baltic Republics

### Baltic Leaders Discuss Common Economic Policy

*LD0510171990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1603 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Yurmala, 5 Oct (TASS)—The prime ministers of the Baltic republics, Ivars Godmanis, Kazimiere Prunskiene, and Edgar Savisaar, met in the Latvian city of Yurmala today to discuss urgent economic problems. The leaders of various ministries—of finance, the economy, commerce, material resources and customs' departments—are taking part in the conference along with them.

The common political desires of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia spur the republics to unity of action in the economy, too. Therefore such meetings have been held frequently. At the level of heads of government and ministers agreements have been concluded on cooperation and regular contacts between specialists of various sectors of the national economy. However, observers think the need has now arisen to undertake new efforts to coordinate actions.

At a recent sitting of the Latvian Supreme Soviet Presidium, deputies criticized their government for the delay in elaborating most important laws which already have been approved in the two other Baltic republics. For instance, Estonia already has adopted laws on property and on taxes, members of the Presidium said, while Latvia has not yet even begun to study the concepts proper. Godmanis acknowledged that the criticism was justified. His statement to the effect that according to preliminary data, next year's budget deficit will run to 1.5 billion rubles gave rise to deputies concern.

They are alarmed also by the growth of state prices in the neighboring republics. It will be more profitable for the Latvian peasant to take his produce to Estonia than to supply local inhabitants. In view of the absence of customs posts, which have been set up only on the borders with Belorussia and Russia, it will not be possible to hold this process in check. In such conditions, the Government of Latvia will find it difficult to keep the promise made to the people to the effect that there will be no price rises in Latvia. The problems of fuel, of the storing of vegetables and potatoes, and of supplying the republic with raw material for industrial enterprises have become exacerbated with the onset of winter. These and other questions, in the opinion of observers, inevitably will be raised at today's meeting in Yurmala.

### Prunskiene Comments

*LD0610120190 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] Government leaders of the three Baltic republics have been meeting in the Latvian resort of Jurmala. The main problem was how to improve joint economic activity and step up the creation of the Baltic market. The meeting once again discussed the agreement on economic cooperation signed last April between Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The government leaders decided that it was essential to remove the differences in prices in the three Baltic republics without delay and agree on a joint attitude toward the Soviet Union's economic policy.

Speaking of the Jurmala meeting, Lithuanian Prime Minister Prunskiene said that a financial war practically has started against the Baltic states because the Soviet Union has unilaterally increased prices of agricultural products.

The meeting also discussed joint border protection, privatization, and other problems.

### Lithuanian Supreme Council Meets 5 Oct

*LD0510140690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Report by correspondent Janina Mecelicaite]

[Text] [Announcer] The third day of plenary sittings of the Supreme Council started today somewhat earlier, at 0900. It will end earlier because many deputies intend to meet with voters today. The sitting itself is described by correspondent Janina Mecelicaite:

[Mecelicaite] After the debates on the agenda, Deputy Zigmas Vaisvila acquainted the deputies with a draft law of municipal police. Deputy Valerijonas Sadreika, on behalf of the legal system commission, proposed that the law on municipal police be adopted together with the police law. A statement by the government asked to postpone the adoption of this law.

Vilnius Mayor Vytautas Bernatonis spoke at the session and urged that they adopt quickly the police law as there is no legal basis for the carrying out of criminal investigations. The municipality must discharge its duty to society and ensure public order and the protection of the citizens' rights and legal interests. It was decided to approve the law on municipal police in the first reading and hand it over for examination to the deputies and commissions. It was proposed that this law be passed next Tuesday.

The second issue discussed at the session was unethical, according to deputies. The matter concerned somebody else's money, that is duty [word indistinct] of the radio and television general director. The deputies as always were sensitive to both radio and television and to a person heading this organization. Therefore they were unable to reach a decision during today's debates, and a draft resolution was returned to the commission of education and science and to the budget commission. Do not think, esteemed listeners, that too high a salary was proposed. [words indistinct]

There was yet another very important issue raised at the session. Deputy Rysardas Maceikianecas condemned an

appeal on yesterday's Panorama program urging Lithuanians to go on Saturday to Eisiskes. In his opinion it would lead to confrontation as well as thwart the initiated dialogue and the work of the state commission to examine the problems of Eastern Lithuania. This issue was also dealt with by Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis. He stated that this was an unexpected, incorrect, and unnecessary appeal. Another appeal may be made today on behalf of the state commission. The Supreme Council chairman thinks the invitation to go to Eisiskes is an escapade of a group of political forces which are perhaps trying to exacerbate the situation. And it is strange that the author of this information relayed by ELTA [Litouskoye Telegrafnoye Agentstvo] cannot be found.

Yet another statement was made by the mandate and ethics commission. It says that an interview by the deputies of the Supreme Council, Stanislovas Pesko and Rysardas Maceikianecas, published in the Polish newspaper OJCZYZNA contains assertions which are not true and which explain in a tendentious manner the political and social events and situation of the Poles in Lithuania. For instance it maintains that from the beginning of the emergence of Sajudis, Polish schools—which are not numerous—have been closed down, among other things. Such arguments by the deputies in that interview pave the way for an unconstitutional conclusion about the need for a Polish administrative unit in southeastern Lithuania. Deputies Stanislovas Pesko and Rysardas Maceikianecas admitted at a meeting of the mandate and ethics commission that some of their assertions have been incorrect or unfounded. The mandate and ethics commission is of the opinion that Deputies Stanislovas Pesko and Rysardas Maceikianecas, being guided by justice and the principles of ethics in the work of the deputies of the Republic of Lithuania, should publish in the Lithuanian and Polish press a denial of assertions which do not correspond with reality.

At present the session is discussing a draft law on personal income tax. I remind you that at 1400 [1200 GMT] there will be question time. Lithuanian radio will broadcast it live

### Leaders Criticize Planned Polish Meeting

*LD0510202490 Moscow TASS in English 2001 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius October 5 TASS—The Presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and the republican government have described as "illegal and senseless" a meeting of deputies of all levels from the Vilnius region planned for Saturday. It is expected to create a national-territorial entity in the areas of a compact settlement of Poles in Lithuania, specifically, around Vilnius.

In a statement published today head of the Lithuanian parliament Vytautas Landsbergis and Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene, who signed this document, blamed the "conservative political circles of the Soviet Union" for the "destabilisation of a political situation in the Lithuanian republic". The statement says that these actions are aimed at "disrupting the forthcoming talks between the Lithuanian Republic and the Soviet Union" and "destroying the positively forming relations between Lithuania and Poland".

The presidium of the Lithuanian parliament and the republican government stated that local self-government and Lithuania's laws create reliable conditions for resolving existing problems without anybody's interference and that the Lithuanian Republic "is defending and will continue to defend its territorial integrity".

The problem of relations between Poles living in Lithuania and the native population has been aggravating of late, especially in the eastern part of the republic, inhabited mostly by Poles. The granting of an official status to the Lithuanian language was one of the reasons for it. A two-year term was set for the transition to Lithuanian in business documents and the services sector despite the fact that in some labour collectives of that region practically nobody speaks Lithuanian. There are 250,000 Poles in the republic, accounting for 8 per cent of the total population. They demand that guarantees be created for the self-expression of the Polish community.

### Landsbergis Makes TV Appeal

*LD0610111990 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] The chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, Vytautas Landsbergis, made an appeal to the nation on the radio urging people not to be guided by the recent calls of the so-called roundtable. The call in question was made yesterday when representatives of Lithuania's political parties, public movements, and organizations gathered at their regular roundtable meeting. They adopted a statement urging citizens of Lithuania to hold a rally in the town of Eisskes on Saturday protesting against the intentions of local municipalities to turn the eastern part of Lithuania into a Polish autonomy. Referring to the roundtable's statement, Vytautas Landsbergis said it was an appeal to minor political groupings that did not go in line with the position of the Lithuanian leadership. He pointed out that anger and vengeance on ethnic grounds were incited by forces opposing Lithuania's independence and that unauthorized removal or destruction of Soviet monuments also played into the hands of Lithuania's enemies. A recent act of such kind was an attempt to blow up a monument to the Soviet Army at (Kriskalnis) in central Lithuania.

### Polish Autonomy Move Viewed

*LD0510101690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuania 2200 GMT 4 Oct 90*

[Commentary by Darius Radzevicius]

[Text] It is ever more noticeable that certain forces in Lithuania, above all people from the CPSU organization in Lithuania and some members of the Polish association, are attempting by every means to inflate the Polish question. If they succeed, the enemies of Lithuania will have a nice trump card in the approaching negotiations with the Soviet Union.

A statement of the [Lithuanian] Supreme Council Presidium and Government published today states that the establishment of a Polish autonomous district is incited by the Soviet Union's conservative forces which will be responsible for the attempt to establish on 6 September some kind of Polish territorial unit and in other ways to destabilize the situation in this country.

The Polish card in the coming negotiations was also mentioned yesterday at a news conference attended by Romualdas Ozolas, chairman of the commission to examine problems of eastern Lithuania and Lithuanian deputy premier, and other members of that commission. The news conference stressed that the most important issue is to find a dialogue that is especially opposed by the members of the CPSU branch in Lithuania. The abovementioned commission failed to get acquainted with the plan for Polish autonomy which is about to be proclaimed. But this is not the most important thing.

Attention was drawn to the fact that rumors about the alleged persecution of the Poles are being disseminated all over the world. Recently a group of Polish intellectuals, thoroughly familiar with history and the present situation in the Vilnius area, published a memorandum to the Polish president, premier, and other prominent state figures; the Catholic Church hierarchy; the UN Human Rights Council; and the European Parliament. That statement distorts or onesidedly presents history, claiming that the territory of Vilnius was before the war an inseparable part of Poland, that the Lithuanians were responsible for the shooting of hundreds of thousands of Polish Jews and for the shooting of thousands of Poles and Russians. It also speaks of the present situation in the Vilnius territory. The Lithuanians are accused of brutal Lithuanization of the country where they have no rights whatsoever. It was stressed at the news conference that Poland's Poles should evaluate this slanderous text. We must prepare for the talks. Commissions should be set up making it possible to evaluate these events. Only then can new relations between both nations be established.

In this state of affairs the conclusions of the commission for the examination of the problems of eastern Lithuania have been eagerly awaited. They were submitted to the Lithuanian legislature by commission chairman Romualdas Ozolas. He stressed that there were four most important questions: the problem of the use of the Lithuanian state language, of the Polish language, and of the languages of other national minorities in eastern Lithuania and the problems of education, culture, higher education, and economy.

Romualdas Ozolas said the main conflict concerning the Lithuanian state language happened because there was too short of a time period envisaged in a law adopted nearly two years ago. The commission proposes that the time of the coming into force of the state language should be extended to 1995.

Speaking of the right of national minorities to use their native languages, the chairman of the commission used a new expression: the majority of national minorities. In draft resolutions submitted by the commission, attempts are being made to solve the problems of eastern Lithuania, taking into consideration this description of the inhabitants of that land. Romualdas Ozolas also proposed preparing and submitting to the government a series of urgent measures which should be implemented without delay.

Economic reform of that land must take place together with economic reform of the whole Lithuania. Apart from that, noted Romualdas Ozolas, there is no need to hurry to proclaim as invalid decisions adopted by local governments in those rayons, in spite of the fact that they are contrary to the laws of the Republic of Lithuania. This way we would show our goodwill, and later we can seek positive solutions.

On the request of Romualdas Ozolas, the Supreme Council deputies decided to approve the conclusions of the commission, publish them in the press, and adopt them three weeks later as having been examined by the people whose fate is mentioned here [as heard]. I would like to finish this commentary with the words uttered by Romualdas Ozolas at yesterday's news conference: Lithuania is able to solve all problems which are encountered by people residing here. There is only one question: Do they wish to seek solutions?

## Vilnius Meeting Discusses Polish Autonomy Issue

*LD0610194490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0900 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Excerpt] Vilnius, 6 Oct (TASS)—The second sitting of the local soviets of people's deputies second congress opened here today along with the Lithuanian Supreme Council and the USSR Supreme Soviet from the Vilnius territory of the Lithuanian Republic. There is a single issue on the agenda: the proclamation of Polish national-territorial autonomy on the Vilnius territory.

This political event has evoked a great public reaction in the republic. The republican press has published a joint statement by the Supreme Council Presidium and Lithuanian Government which expresses its nonagreement in principle to the proclamation of a Polish national-territorial administrative unit at the congress of deputies.

"We shall not permit," the document says, "narrow provincialism and ill will to inflict this damage on our

common Lithuania." An appeal to Lithuanian citizens was read on republican television. It called on them to hinder the work of the second congress of Vilnius territory deputies. [passage omitted]

### Polish National Area Declared

*LD0610180190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] We have just received a report from ELTA special correspondent Algimantas Degutis from Eisiskes:

After five hours of discussions, a declaration has been adopted on the announcement of a Polish national territorial area within the Vilnius region, having its status within the structure of Lithuania. It is anticipated that the Vilnius and Salcininkai rayons and certain areas of Trakai, Svencioniai, and Sirvintai should be included within this unit.

## Leaders Interviewed on Talks With Moscow

### Landsbergis Views Talks

*LD0610123890 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Interview with Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis by correspondent Jonas Budrys in Vilnius; date not given—live or recorded; Landsbergis speaks in Lithuanian fading into English translation]

[Text] [Budrys] If we look at the official communique issued jointly on Tuesday [2 October] by both delegations it appears that the Soviet Union is ready to negotiate with Lithuania on the premise that Lithuania is a separate state. Do you think that this is consistent with their actual point of view?

[Landsbergis] One gets that impression from the communique, and we are of course pleased that this kind of statement was made by both sides. During the discussions, however, it was obvious that we were looked upon as lower, as being under their rule. But we were persistent in steering the talks back to a partnership position.

[Budyrs] Although President Gorbachev was not present at the talks on Tuesday [12 October], nor is he the official chairman, is he nonetheless in charge of them?

[Landsbergis] We have no doubt that the Soviet delegation is proceeding under Gorbachev's command. They will act according to his mandate and his directive.

[Budrys] Do you think that Gorbachev will bargain in good faith, or will he continue to put on a smile for the rest of the world while squeezing Lithuania in her vulnerable areas? Is it just a ploy?

[Landsbergis] I think the Soviet Union will try any means to keep Lithuania under its control and rule, any means which they feel would be acceptable to the rest of the world. They are trying to worsen interstate relations between Lithuania and other nations, and as an example of their interference within Lithuania they are now trying to entice Lithuanians of Polish nationality to form a separate state inside Lithuania, causing instability in that region.

[Budrys] Are these the kind of things which the Western nations would find difficult to perceive as interference?

[Landsbergis] The West will be able to see the difference if it wants, if it looks, because the Soviets are doing this across the board. But the West can of course pretend that they do not understand that this is interference. Another very powerful way that Moscow interferes with the Lithuanian economy is through the factories and manufacturing industries. Many of the supervisors in the industrial sector are directly accountable to Moscow and when directed can undermine production throughout the whole economy.

[Budrys] Mr. Gorbachev has expanded his power during the 500 days of its economic plan and now has the right to dissolve the governments of the republics—do you have a fear that he might use this in Lithuania?

[Landsbergis] Of course he has no right to do it in Lithuania as we are no longer one of his republics. I think that if he wanted to resort to this kind of tactic he would have already done so much earlier. On the other hand I know enough about that part of the world to expect anything, that from them one should rule nothing out.

[Budrys] A small nation tried to regain its independence from out of the whole of a larger one. The leader of that large nation responds by sending tanks and paratroopers into the small country. When the boys of the small nation leave the army of the larger, fearing for their lives, he has them captured and brought back. When the small still will not let go of their independence declaration he closes their borders, expels foreign journalists, and inflicts a blockade which ruins the small nation's economy. In your opinion is this the kind of man who deserves a Nobel Prize for peace?

[Landsbergis] If I were to decide this question I would have doubts. But the people who will in fact make that decision will probably give him the Nobel Peace Prize and then we will congratulate Mr. Gorbachev for his winning. These kind of things are not decided in absolute terms. Perhaps those who make the choices might feel that the appearance of peace elsewhere, in what they see in larger terms, is more important than his little war somewhere else.

### Ozolas Expects Treaty With USSR

*LD0810144390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1405 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Text] Vilnius, 8 Oct (TASS)—"The negotiations with the Soviet Union will end with the signing of a treaty on the recognition of the Lithuanian republic. I think this will happen no later than the first half of next year,"

Romualdas Ozolas, deputy prime minister of the Lithuanian Republic, stated. Reviewing the events of the past week on Lithuanian television yesterday evening, the vice premier pointed out that the dialogue could only have such an outcome on the condition that "the negotiations are not broken off because of any conditions or obligations."

Regarding the first consultative meeting between the delegations of the Lithuanian Republic and the USSR held last week, Romualdas Ozolas assessed it as "productive." He announced that the day after tomorrow, 10 October, it would probably become clear how the negotiations will actually proceed—a conference of the joint working group to prepare for negotiations between the Lithuanian Republic and the USSR is to be held in Moscow on that day.

Romualdas Ozolas described the economic situation in Lithuania on the eve of the "era of negotiations" as "not very good." He acknowledged that violence and profiteering are on the rise in Lithuania.

The deputy head of government sees only one key to overcoming these negative tendencies and to resolving these problems—privatization. He said that on Monday at the sitting of the government a program for privatization of state property and a draft law on privatization will be discussed, and that the first steps in this direction should be made in the very near future.

Touching upon the political situation in Lithuania, Romualdas Ozolas voiced the opinion that certain forces in the republic "are acting in the interests of the CPSU and the Kremlin." To confirm this thesis, he cited the decision taken by the meeting of the "autonomists" in the town of Eisisks on 6 October about setting up a Polish autonomous kray in the Lithuanian republic. He also stated that "the right wing radicals are planning decisive steps," directed, in his opinion, at replacing the present government.

### Lithuanian Official Urges Youth To Ignore Draft

*LD0510105990 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius October 5 TASS—A representative of the Lithuanian Department for the Protection of the Territory has called on Lithuanian youth to refuse to serve in the Soviet armed forces.

In a televised address on Thursday evening, he said the activities of military registration and enlistment offices on Lithuanian territory have been suspended. "Pay no attention to call-up papers and do not go to the offices," he said.

"The address is aimed to undermine the authority of the Soviet Army and its combat readiness," acting head of the Political Department of the Republican Military Registration and Enlistment Commissariat Algirdas Stulginskas told TASS. "The Soviet law on universal military service is in force on Lithuanian territory, and we will strictly observe it."

### Vilnius Council Disapproves of Soviet Army March

*LD0810151590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuania 1000 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[Text] We have just received an appeal to Vilnius residents [word indistinct] by the Vilnius City Council Presidium. The Vilnius City Council Presidium does not approve of a possible military parade by Soviet Armed Forces in Vilnius on 7 November and suggests Vilnius residents do not take part in such militaristic manifestations and demonstrations.

### French Bank Reportedly Holds Baltic Gold

*LD0610124690 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] The Lithuanian daily LIETUVOS RYTAS states that the French Foreign Ministry has found in its archives a dossier containing documents about relations between France and the Baltic states. A problem has emerged about what to do if the Baltic states become independent and demand that their property—buildings of their former diplomatic missions—be returned.

A Soviet Consulate is now housed in the former Latvian diplomatic mission. The Lithuanian mission is occupied by the Soviet information bureau, and the reconstructed building belonging to Estonia is now inhabited by Soviet diplomatic officials.

There is also another problem. Of over 3 tonnes of gold deposited before the World War II, one tonne belongs to Latvia and the rest to Lithuania. The directors of the bank where the alloys are stored stated that the gold would be returned to the governments of those countries which are recognized by France.

### Landsbergis European Visits Outlined

*LD0610184190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis will visit Iceland on an official visit from 8-11 October following an invitation by Steingrimur Hermannsson, that country's prime minister.

Today he departed for Moscow. Vytautas Landsbergis will leave from there tomorrow morning for a one-day visit to Oslo during which he will participate in the Lithuanian Information Center's opening ceremony.

Following his visit to Iceland, the Supreme Council chairman will also go to Paris where he will deliver a report at a roundtable conference organized by the French Republican Party and will meet with some of that country's well-known politicans.

## Latvian People's Front Holds Third Congress

### Program Rejects Communism

*PM0510145990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 2*

[Report by correspondent I. Litvinova: "New Latvian People's Front Program"]

[Text] Riga—Two weeks before its third congress the Latvian People's Front [LPF] submitted a draft new program for discussion.

Romualds Razuks, current chairman of the People's Front Duma board, noted that the new edition of the program is an abbreviated one—the repeated declaration of generally accepted democratic norms and values as well as the culture, science, and ecology sections having been dropped. The chairman stressed that the program places the emphasis on political goals. First and foremost there is the de-occupation of Latvia. It "must begin with the localization of USSR Armed Forces at military bases determined by intergovernmental treaties and with the cessation of USSR state institutions' activities."

Commenting on the new program, the LPF Duma board chairman noted that nonrecognition of all forms of communism and national socialism and other teachings, which in his opinion reject democracy, features in it for the first time. There were many Communists among the creators and activists of the People's Front. Now they are faced with a choice because the program stresses the incongruity of participation in the LPF by those who hold Communist and "other totalitarian views." We must not land Latvia with the Romanian-Bulgarian option, R. Razuks said, because there the weak democratic parties lost out to Communists who had changed their spots. He explained that the program makes the final break with the Latvian Communist Party and with the independent Communist Party—now renamed the Democratic Labor Party.

Observers note that many sections of the program are contradictory. It is generally accepted that representatives of the People's Front are now in power in the republic at all levels—the chairman himself says that 8,000 People's Front members have been elected to soviets—but the program's political section urges a struggle against the concentration of power in the hands of any party, group of people, or individual. In the economic section the course of market relations features alongside support for the state monopoly. While declaring the harmonization of interethnic relations, the program says that the People's Front will support the creation of a system to train Latvian national cadres for the national economy while ethnic minorities—in the republic that includes Russians—are only entitled to receive secondary education in their native languages.

The LPF Congress will be held on 6-7 October in Riga.

### Congress Opens

*LD0610171390 Moscow TASS in English 1356 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaitsev]

[Text] Riga October 6 TASS—The third congress of the Latvian People's Front, which opened here today, will debate a new charter and programme and elect the front's governing bodies during its two-day work.

The congress is being attended by 760 delegates representing 170,000 members. The front advocates the restoration of the republic's full independence.

Board chairman of the front's council Romulds Razuks said that "we have to understand the present situation: where we are going, who is going with us, who our allies are. I'm not satisfied with the People's Front activities."

The last problem is especially pressing, since the front has lost about 50,000 members during the past year since the second congress.

It is also planned to change the front's top echelon. The post of the front chairman now occupied by Dainis Ivans will remain, while the post of the board chairman of the front council occupied by Razukas will be abolished.

In addition to his deputy, the front chairman will have his own team: its members will be hand-picked by the new chairman. They will make up 50 percent of the front's council. The second half will be elected by the next congress.

Candidates for the leader's post have not been named. Nevertheless, the majority of the front's activists are of the opinion that Ivans, 35, who headed the front for two years, should bow out.

During this time, he was elected to the Soviet parliament and became first vice-president of the Latvian parliament.

### Razuks Elected New Leader

*LD0710203490 Moscow TASS in English 1833 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaitsev]

[Text] Riga October 7 TASS—Romualds Razuks, 34, has been elected new leader of Latvia's Popular Front, replacing Dainis Ivans, who led the movement since its founding two years ago.

Razuks, a doctor by profession, told the movement's congress today that the Popular Front is Latvia's only capable political force.

Latvia needs a radical political, social and economic programme, supported by broad sections of the population, Razuks believes.

However, it is too early to call Latvia's Popular Front the republic's largest movement, observers believe. About 50,000 members quit the front this year.

### Razuks on Main Task

*LD0710014890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Report by N. Kazyanova in Riga; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Third LPF Congress has started in Latvia.

[Kazyanova] The Congress marks another stage in the life of the Front which has taken key positions at all levels of power in the republic. Precise figures were given: 8,000 LPF members have been elected to soviets.

[R. Razuks, chairman of the LPF Duma board] Our main task, jointly with all the democratic forces of the republic, is that we must advance further in implementing the dismantling of the existing patriotic and conducting reforms, in order to create a life worthy of human beings for all those in Latvia.

[Kazyanova] Those attending the congress are to confirm the new LPF program and charter which was proposed for discussion on the eve of the congress. Changes in the charter are envisaged. It is proposed to elect one LPF chairman and one deputy. They will be elected by the congress by secret ballot. The congress will also elect half the Duma while the other half will be elected by rayon at the conference.

On the eve of the congress there was a lively debate in the press on the possibility of setting up an influential new party based on the LPF. But the majority of the aktiv reject the (?reformation) of the LPF, considering that the movement consists of a number of political trends. Should the Front fall apart, there would remain small parties with large differences with one another.

### Goldmanis Addresses Congress

*LD0710235390 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1053 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[Speech by Ivars Godmanis, Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Miners Presidium chairman, at the Third LPF Congress, in Riga—live]

[Text] We are not saying what we should be saying here. Three years have passed and I would expect branch representatives here not to fix the situation; not to—as some I have heard here do—politically declare what was written a long time ago in the program of the second congress; and not to seek applause for all the known matters as I just heard Vidins do.

I expected something else here. I expected branch representatives to come here and respond with what we, the LPF branch that has gained a majority in the corresponding rayon, rural, district, and local council, has accomplished. Instead, everyone comes to me during the breaks saying: How terrible! We are being plundered! We are being plundered here and there, and here and there!

I apologize. We can of course strive; we have also accomplished something. We have imposed customs duties, we are fighting speculation, and so on. But this has to be done by you at lower levels.

You must do this. The following version does not any longer fit there. I read for example this program. What do I notice there? I notice two things there which are entirely incompatible: You to the market, and we invite the market, but at the same time we demand that we preserve conditions worthy of human beings everywhere.

I apologize. In the best instance, we can preserve conditions worthy of some human beings: for invalids, for pensioners, for those who are unable to work themselves. If a healthy man comes to me and says that I have a 150 ruble salary and because of that I am not able to manage, I will tell him: go and look for another job! [applause]

I want to talk about two things. I support what the Vidzeme representative said. But where are they when executive structures must be formed? Where are you when the executive power must be entered into, when the executive power must be entered? I apologize. The People's Front triumphed in local council elections; all chairmen of executive committees all over Latvia remained practically the same. What does that mean?

That means that, among us, there are people ready to discuss, to speak, to decide, but not to do. Not to do. [applause]

As my term approaches its end I want to say specifically what I see that the Front must do.

We fought for two years to form two committees: the national economic committee and the industrial committee. I remember Skapars, Millers, and I—we worked long and hard to form a People's Front of industrial enterprises. It did not succeed. We were criticized by workers. This idea must succeed; this idea must be developed further. There must be a national economic committee.

Do understand, if the People's Front does not exert pressure on the faction and does not tell them how this privatization has to be politically arranged, there will be utter chaos. We in the government have already drawn up at least 10 plans; we cannot put them into operation because of political factors. There is profound truth in what Bernards said.

Who will decide that? That will be decided by the Supreme Council. But under whose influence will they decide it? If if is the supreme council of the People's Front, for example, if it is the People's Front faction at the Supreme Council, then it has to decide on the basis of the resolutions of the People's Front.

There must be a sitting of the Dome in the future, for the sitting of the Dome ends with a resolution. So then, how do we privatize? That way or this way? How will we land reform? This way or this way?

If we cannot do that, this is the first stage; if we are unable to show these resolutions at the Dome sitting for the Supreme Council in practice, then we are of no use. This is only the first part. All that I have heard here is very beautiful, but who would be the people to implement it? Where will they be?

I will tell you directly: there will be such a situation. I come here and say my piece, and after that I honestly go to my job and continue to work, and of course (?all) come and say: We are being plundered! We are being robbed by speculators! Today they come to me at the market of Ciekurkalns to sell cigarettes.

Where is the Vidzeme suburb branch? Why do they not have a look at the market of Ciekurkalns?

Where are the people's front branches, let us say at the vehicle, bus station, at the taxi stand? Is this the only thing then, to write letters to me? After all, there is local power. Disconnect water and electricity! Close those enterprises! [applause]

I will say only one thing: We must understand that we live on two levels. We must understand, that when Rubiks meets the heads of all enterprises of the republic two to three days after I have met them, then that talk there is very specific and very exact. There is no talk about upper political echelons.

If we do not recognize these resolutions of ours, these programs of ours—may the program be (?like that), but let there be a mechanism and a stance—if we do not see our future work at the branches clearly and well, not only shoW how to do it but who will do it, then we will remain in these two levels, and then those who formerly head the political power will take all the economic power, and those who have the economic power will sooner or later return to political power.

Thank you. [applause]

### Congress Meets for Second Day

*LD0810043990 Moscow TASS in English 2008 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga October 7 TASS—A total of 760 delegates, representing 170,000 members of the Latvian People's Front, gathered in Riga today for the front's third congress.

"Corridors of Soviet power can lead [words indistinct] into a deadend," the Front's former Chairman Dainis Ivans said in his opening remarks, calling for changes in Latvia's state system.

The front aims to "restore Latvia's state independence", according to the movement's programme.

It supports Latvia's complete "de-occupation", which shall begin with the "localisation" of Soviet Armed Forces at military bases and closure of Soviet state agencies in the republic.

New popular front leader, Romualds Razuks, blasted the so-called "national-communists" (members of the independent Communist Party, which recently became the Democratic Labour Party) for attempts to weaken the popular front and establish a new party monopoly on power.

"Membership in Latvia's Popular Front is incompatible with communist, national-socialist and other totalitarian views, with defence of methods pursued by the administrative-command, bureaucratic leadership, and national and other enmity," the Front's draft programme says.

Only independent political organisations with a ruling body in Latvia should be allowed in the republic, Front leaders believe.

The Front's parliamentary leader Janis Dinevics told the congress the front's parliamentary fraction still has no plan of action. "It is time to stop discussing trifles in parliament and take up global issues," he said.

### Latvian People's Front Congress Concludes

*LD0810204690 Moscow TASS in English 1915 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaitsev]

[Text] Riga October 8 TASS—The third congress of the Latvian People's Front which ended here today, showed that it has turned during the past two years into a radical organisation out of a mass democratic movement.

The policy-making documents adopted by the congress corroborate this claim.

The Front's platform concurs in many respects with the opinion of the Movement for Latvia's National Independence and citizens' committees, which advocate the priority of the Latvian nation.

Although the Front's new chairman Romualds Razuks said that the "Front should be a highly moral organisation not connected with political adventurism and shady compromises", all these can be realised only partially: only with respect to representatives of the indigenous nationality.

In the opinion of congress delegates, human rights should be sacrificed to the right of the nation, and the democratic idea—to the national idea.

Attacks on other parties which do not fully share the front's ideas and rabid anti-communism shown at the congress, do not agree with calls for a democratic and human society.

Leader of the Front's group in the republican parliament Janis Dinevics even suggested that the congress draft a concept of new institutes of authority which would exclude any opposition.

Congress delegates repeatedly voiced the need to create a "Latvian Latvia" during the two days of their work.

The congress ignored the question of what role non-Latvians making up 48 per cent of the republican population would play in Latvian society.

### Estonia To Nationalize Communist Party Property

*LD0610132190 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn October 6 (TASS)—The Estonian Government considered making the real estate belonging to the republican Communist Party Estonia's property.

Proponents of such a move say the party had widely used budget funds and state material resources to build and operate its buildings and structures.

The government took a decision on this issue and worked out a draft resolution, which it will submit to the Estonian parliament.

The government made no mention of the Estonian Communist Party's publishing house where practically all Tallinn-based newspapers and magazines are printed.

## RSFSR

### Coverage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings

#### 5 Oct Session Reported

*LD0510221490*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1923 GMT on 5 October carries the 59-minute "Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Soviet Diary" program comprising recorded highlights of the 5 October session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

The program begins by noting that Deputy Goryacheva chaired a joint session of the chambers debating the draft law on property. Sergey Nikolayevich Krasavchenko, chairman of the Committee on Economic Reform and Ownership, addressed the session. The law on property must be the "law of laws" enabling further progress of related social legislations; it is essential for further economic progress, he says.

At 1927 GMT Deputy Ispravnikov, secretary of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Supreme Economic Council, takes the floor: "Who is against private property today? I shall quote Academician Abalkin's oft published utterance. He says more or less the following: everything we have had and still have belongs to the state rather than to anybody in particular. I do not believe that is quite right. If here in our country everything is the state's, then that does not necessarily mean it does not belong to anybody in particular. What it means is that a certain stratum of people has all our wealth and all the fruits of our labor at its disposal. This stratum usurps all these sources and redistributes everything from the center. Those corrupt quarters which—having amassed a vast amount of personal property by constantly dealing in cars, taking bribes in return for apartments, etc.—rail against private property undoubtedly have an interest in this. And indeed to ignore the phenomenon of this vast personal wealth today means quite simply to mislead the people.

"I believe we must now dispense with the barrack-room socialism principle of the favors for some and the dregs for others. And that is enshrined in the bill.

"The bill ensures a rejection of the dogma that the state is to all intents and purposes the only protagonist in the economy, before whom the economic interests of the individual matter not a jot in the boundless sea of arbitrariness. I also believe we must realize that—as we have set out in Section Three—the economic interests both of the private individual and of the state are very important. And therefore the contradiction between private and state property as expressed in the bill is overcome by taking into account all forms of property and by granting them equal rights.

"Undoubtedly, when we speak of state property on the territory of Russia we are laying a legal basis beneath what are today our perfectly justifiable and genuine questions: how to form the state budget? What is the state budget on the territory of Russia? And what are the state taxes which ought to come our way today, rather than being based on the principle of what is left over as some at the center believe is necessary and desirable?

"Today I also believe it is a legitimate question: Where are our oil, diamonds, and gold going? And on what is the income from them being spent?"

Deputy Ispravnikov goes on to cite a number of articles dealing with various forms of property; ownership of land forms a separate session, he contends.

At 1936 GMT Nikolay Timofeyevich Ryabov takes the floor to discuss forms of state, municipal, and private ownership; private individuals are given wide rights under the bill to various unprecedented forms of ownership, within the specific limits he notes. There has been much criticism of the arbitrary actions by party and Komsomol organizations in regard to property; the bill precludes such abuses and contains legal safeguards in regard to property rights. Given the unstable situation of

society and the market today, the adoption of the bill on ownership is essential in order to give the incentive for entrepreneurship.

At 1943 GMT Deputy Petrov asks about the concept of municipal property, given that there are no municipalities. Ryabov explains the Latin root of words.

At 1945 GMT Deputy Kim from Ulyanovsk asks how exhaustive the enumeration of types of ownership is in specified articles of the bill. Ryabov gives an answer which fails to satisfy Kim. The latter points out further statements in the bill which he finds incomprehensible. Ryabov's replies at length; Kim asks why one provision differentiates between religious organizations and other types of organization.

At 1950 GMT Ispravnikov returns to the rostrum to answer this question.

At 1951 GMT a question is asked from the floor by Deputy Volkov on inheritance and on the right of expropriated kulaks to demand restitution of confiscated property. Ispravnikov says this is an issue which must be studied.

At 1953 GMT Ispravnikov is asked a question from the floor on a legalistic point regarding ownership of land compared to other forms of propert and on how speculation in land is to be avoided. Ispravnikov says that mechanisms are needed to deal with these aspects once the bill is made law.

At 1955 GMT Krasavchenko comes to the rostrum to differentiate between ownership of a plot of land and of public land.

At 1957 GMT Ryabov answers a question related to the above, on how ownership of natural resources is to be defined and regulated. A further question relates to the definition of a plot of land, diversity of land use.

At 2000 GMT a deputy from Kabardino-Balkariya asks about the rights of state and collective farms in the bill. Ryabov points to the articles relating to these as economic associations. Ispravnikov takes up the reply, noting that there are various classifications of juridical persons mentioned in the bill.

At 2003 GMT Deputy (Chutin) says that sovereignty of the RSFSR over natural resources and land is not defined in the bill. This renders the bill toothless in defense of RSFSR interests. Ryabov draws attention to articles which do indeed enshrine RSFSR economic sovereignty. (Chutin) then suggests an amendment to the wording. Ispravnikov points out the need to get away from the concept of state ownership of all wealth.

At 2009 GMT a deputy points out from the floor that there are no mechanisms to implement the law in the bill and raises the question of a referendum on legislation such as this. Ryabov says that legislation is required to stabilize the economy; a referendum would be the thin end of the wedge on basic concepts such as this bil.

At 2012 GMT Deputy (Khitagorov) points out contradictions in the bill between articles referring to the rights of the center and the autonomous republics; and asks about the division of ownership between the Union, RSFSR, autonomous formations, local levels, and the individual. Other deputies take up the same point.

At 2019 GMT Deputy Vinogradova says that Teacher's Day is to be marked on Sunday. In this connection, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet should ensure that legislation on raising salaries for teachers is implemented. She reads an appeal to RSFSR teachers on the vital importance of schooling. Goryacheva says an appeal should be published on behalf of the deputies and calls an intermission. After the intermission, the chambers are to meet in separate sessions.

At 2022 GMT the relay ends.

### Bill on Ownership Discussed

*LD0510153390 Moscow TASS in English 1523 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Yuriy Kozmin, and Pavel Ostrov]

[Text] Moscow, October 5 TASS—In a surprise move today, Russian parliamentary deputies voted to change the original agenda and begin discussing an ownership bill, which will allow government, municipal and private property.

Presenting the bill to a full-scale sitting of the Supreme Soviet this morning, Sergey Krasavchenko, chairman of the legislature's Committee on Economic Reform and Ownership, said that its enactment could become a "truly historic event in the life of the Russian Republic".

He said that when adopted, the bill would be the first legal act backing up the transition to a market-driven economy in the republic under the "500 days" programme, and pave the way to a series of other laws, including those on land, enterprise and privatization and even the Russian Constitution.

The bill allows the private ownership of land, stock, enterprises and transport facilities both by Soviet nationals and foreigners and, for example, religious organisations.

It envisages a range of measures to protect the right of ownership, including from illegitimate actions by state agencies, and stipulates that all property owners, including the government, must play by the same market-economy rules.

The bill takes a new attitude to mass organisations. After its entry into force, all of them, including political parties, will lose the right to own any property and pursue related economic activities until re-registration with governing councils.

The debate on the bill was split on political, economic and psychological lines, with many parliamentary deputies opposed to the private ownership of land.

Others, however, argued that the law would only remain in effect during the transition to a market-based economy and that the land ownership issue could later be reviewed.

This issue will apparently form the centrepiece of the debate on the bill, which was discussed after a break this afternoon by the parliament's two chambers at separate meetings.

### 8 Oct Session Reported

*LD0810203490*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1940 GMT on 8 October carries the 22-minute "Diary of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet" program.

S. Shakhray, chairman of the Legislation Committee, is interviewed on the differences and similarities between the Russian and Soviet ownership provisions as reflected in the relevant laws. The Union law introduces various levels of ownership: Union ownership, republican ownership, and so forth. The RSFSR law goes further—all types of ownership are equal. Individuals must benefit from the new provisions contained in the ownership law. Ours is a more specific and a more developed law, getting rid of the various shortcomings of the Union law, Shakhray said.

It is not a normal situation when we adopt a law, but the USSR Supreme Soviet pretends it knows nothing about it. We should have joint working groups and joint examinations of issues.

At 1946 GMT USSR people's deputy Yu. S. Stadnik agrees that joint work is essential otherwise anomalies might occur such as executive bodies being subordinated to republican and union bodies, to give an example.

Other deputies debate whether Union laws are made for a unitary state or whether they are more suitable to a federation. Shakray says that the broadest possible consensus is desirable here in the interest of democracy and decision-making being decentralized. Otherwise the peasants and workers will be as far removed from ownershipi as has always been the case.

At 1954 GMT the Committee on Social Policy is shown deliberating. It is important, says M.L. Zakharov, chairman of the committee, to demarcate between Union and republican and shared ownership. Zakharov outlines the scope of the committee's work.

### 9 Oct Session Reported

*LD0910105290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0900 GMT 9 Oct 90*

[Report by Yuriy Korotkov from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Today a joint sitting of the chambers of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is in progress. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin was not chiaring the session as we had expected; instead it was his first deputy Ruslan Khasbulatov. The morning session as usual began with discussion of various issues. In particular, the deputies spoke about public indignation at empty shelves in Yaroslavl and Severdvinsk; about the stepping up of attacks by conservatives against democratic forces; about the exacerbation of the political, social, and financial-economic situation in the republic; and about Latvia's and Estonia's claims to part of the territory of Pskov Oblast.

The deputies went on to the main point on today's agenda, on the socioeconomic situation in the RSFSR and the plan for practical actions to implement the program for stabilization of the economy and the transition to market relations. Gennadiy Innokentyevich Filshin, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, briefed deputies on the urgent measures and the main guidelines for the republic to escape the state of crisis. Considerable reductions of capital investments in many basic industries are anticipated, in particular in the construction and the fuel and power complexes. Replying to a question from deputies, Filshin expressed his opinion that the latest presidential decrees are in fact blocking the implementation of the 500 days program for transition to the market.

The same concern was then voiced by Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. He dwelled on several measures for practical implementation of the 500-day program. He said that since this program was endorsed by the Russian parliament a month ago, the situation in the country—both political and economic—has become much more complicated. What is more, a continued departure from the radical course is taking place. Delays in the implementation of this program by the Union legislature, the Russian prime minister said, are leading to negative and unpredictable consequences. Thus this program will no longer be able to be implemented in the way that was envisaged earlier. As a result, harsher measures will have to be adopted and adjustments will have to be made while the implementation of the program is under way.

A brief break in the joint sitting of the chambers has just been announced.

### RSFSR Politburo Discusses Perestroyka, Economy

*LD0810233690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1721 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[Text] Moscow, 8 Oct (TASS)—The course of work on the draft of the basic areas of activity of the Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] was examined at a sitting of the Central Committee Politburo of this party. A report on the sitting distributed today does not say when it was held.

In accordance with an instruction of the constituent congress, a working group of Central Committee members has

prepared documents taking into account the debates at the congress and the ideas of party organizations and the republic's Communists. It was deemed important to propose a dynamic and constructive document expressing the standpoint of the RSFSR Communist Party on matters of accelerating the processes of perestroyka and the renewal of the republic's socioeconomic political, and spiritual life, and reflecting the needs and desires of the working people. Note was taken of the need for a clear definition of attitude to the programs for the stabilization of the eocnomy and the transition to a market, especially with respect to the privatization of property, land, and enterprises and the protection of the social rights and political freedoms of citizens of the RSFSR.

It was proposed that work be done in greater depth on the sections which define the ideological platform of the Communist Party, the methods and forms of work with the masses, and ways of cooperating with progressive public movements and forces which stand for the socialist choice and for interethnic and civil accord, for the sake of the rebirth of Russia in a renewed USSR.

The draft of the main areas of activity of the RSFSR Communist Party will be published in the press and after discussion by party organizations will be submitted for examination by a joint plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Committee of the RSFSR Communist Party.

Questions raised by Communists and working people during numerous meetings between members of the Politburo of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and work collectives and party organizations and also those contained in letters and verbal appeals to the Central Committee were examined at the sitting.

Members of the Politburo described the sociopolitical situation in the country as complex and volatile and called for energetic opposition to extremist forces leading a destructive attack on the revolutionary achievements of the people and on the theoretical heritage and personality of Lenin. A statement by the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat: "On the 73d Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution" was supported.

Matters relating to preparations for the next plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the RSFSR were discused at the sitting.

## Paper Reports Meeting

*PM0910115590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Oct 90 Second Edition p 4*

[Unattributed report: "At the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo: Act Openly and According to Principle"]

[Text] The tumultuous and contradictory processes of sociopolitical life and the need to work energetically to fulfill the decisions adopted by the RSFSR Communist Party Constituent Congress demand a prompt and thorough analysis of events, a knowledge of the situation locally, a clear stance on all problems of principle, and competent and verified responses to the challenge of the time.

In this connection a session of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo discussed a number of topical questions.

It examined the course of work on the draft basic guidelines of the RSFSR Communist Party's activity whose adoption is awaited impatiently by Russia's party organizations and Communists. In accordance with the Constituent Congress' instructions, a working group of Central Committee members has prepared materials taking into account the congress discussions and the ideas of the republic's party organizations and Communists.

The session recognized the importance of presenting a dynamic and constructive document which expresses the RSFSR Communist Party's position on questions of accelerating the processes of perestroyka and the renewal of the republic's socioeconomic, political, and spiritual life which meet working people's needs and aspirations. Note was made of the need for a precise definition of the attitude toward the programs for the stabilization of the economy and the transition to the market, particularly with regard to the privatization of property, land, and industrial enterprises and the protection of RSFSR citizens' social rights and political freedoms.

It was proposed to work more thoroughly on the sections which determine the Communist Party's ideological platform, methods, and forms of work among the masses as well as paths of cooperation with progressive social movements and forces adhering to socialist positions and interethnic and civic consensus for the sake of reviving Russia within a renewed USSR.

The version that had been prepared was adopted as the document's conceptual basis. The task that was set is to complete its elaboration and take into account the materials of the conference at the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee with social scientists.

The draft basic guidelines for the RSFSR Communist Party's activity will be published in the press, and after discussion in party organizations will be submitted to the examination of a joint plenum of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission.

The session examined questions raised by Communists and working people during numerous meetings with members of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo in labor collectives and party organizations as well as those expressed in letters and oral messages to the Central Committee. Direct contact at local level, an analysis of letters, and the reception of citizens show that working people are pinning great hopes on the RSFSR Communist Party which they see as

a political force capable of supporting and defending their interests. At the same time there is alarm at the fact that the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and party organizations are losing the initiative and not giving a resolute rebuff to those destructive forces which are fuelling political hysteria and anticommunism in society and driving the country to the brink of civil disobedience and destabilization and interethnic strife.

During an exchange of opinions on the position of the Russophone population in the Union republics and the refugee problem, the proposal was put to Communist deputies that they submit this question to the examination of the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets and secure all-around support and help for people forced to leave their homes or subject to discrimination on political or ethnic grounds.

Assessing the sociopolitical situation in the country as complex and explosive, the Politburo members called for energetic opposition to those extremist forces who are leading a destructive attack on the people's revolutionary gains, V.I. Lenin's theoretical legacy, and Lenin himself. The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat's statement "On the 73d Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution" was supported.

The session discussed questions connected with the preparation for the routine RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Plenum.

### Yeltsin's State of Health Reported 'Normal'

*LD0610162990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1937 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[From the "Vid" program]

[Text] Now, questions. We are asked about Boris Yeltsin's health. As was reported at one of the sittings of the Russian Supreme Soviet by [First Vice President] Ruslan Khasbulatov, Yeltsin's state of health is normal.

### Leningrad Communists Appeal to CPSU Plenum

*LD0610185390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] A group of party activists of the Leningrad CPSU organization, members of the CPSU Central Committee, and members of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Communist Party have appealed to the forthcoming CPSU Central Committee plenum in a letter published in today's Leningrad PRAVDA. Talking about their growing concern for the country and party's future, the authors of the letter consider that the Central Committee plenum could, in particular, suggest that party organizations for the sake of public accord see their main task at present in organizing practical participation of Communists in the search for and implementation of the optimal and less painful ways of the transfer of work collectives to a market system.

The authors of the letter propose to Communists-deputies of the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets that they put forward a question on adopting in the near future laws and other documents that would guarantee social protection and support for citizens in the new economic conditions, and that they continue the search for constitutional ways of improving the efficiency of the work of executive powers at all levels.

Among the recommendations proposed during the confirmation of the 1991 budget was one to give maximum support to possible budget financing of education, culture, and public health, and to put forward a question on a universal referendum on key issues of economic programs offered.

### Leningrad Fuel Reserves To Run Out 22 Oct

*LD0910130390 Moscow World Service in Russian 1045 GMT 9 Oct 90*

[Text] All passenger vehicles could grind to a halt in Leningrad on 22 October, the day when, according to the specialists, the reserve fuel supplies now being used by the city's transportation association runs out. Yevgeniy Butkevich, one of the association managers, says that the situation has come about following the Union government's decision to cut gasoline supplies. Unless emergency measures are taken, thousands of buses and taxis will be immobilized and the subway, streetcars, and trolleys will be overloaded.

### Buryat Autonomous Republic Declares Sovereignty

*LD0810184890 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Sergey Trofimov]

[Text] Ulan-Ude October 8 TASS—The parliament of Russia's Autonomous Republic of Buryatia, in Siberia, adopted a declaration of state sovereignty at its second session, which opened in Ulan-Ude, Buryatia's capital today.

Buryatia has abandoned its status of an autonomous republic and proclaimed itself the Buryat Soviet Socialist Republic—a sovereign multi-nation state within the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union.

The declaration states that the republic is delegating some of its powers to Russia and the Union on the basis of the federal and Union treaties.

It has also proclaimed the precedence of Buryatia's constitution and laws over those of the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union to "guarantee its sovereignty."

Laws and other acts infringing on the interests of the peoples of Buryatia will be suspended on the republic's territory and re-examined.

The declaration proclaims the "land, its minerals, water and other natural resources and the air space on Buryatia's territory," as well as its economic, scientific, and technical potential, the republic's property and the basis of its economic sovereignty, which should be used to meet the material and spiritual requirements of its peoples." [quotation marks as received]

The declaration said Russian and Buryat will not be the state languages of the Buryat Republic. At the same time, "all citizens of the republic are guaranteed the right to freely develop and use their native tongue."

Chairman of the Buryat Parliament Sergey Buldayev said the declaration was the basis for drafting a new constitution for the republic and concluding the federal and union treaties.

He said the republic's sovereignty "aims, above all, to expand the powers of councils of people's deputies at all levels."

The Buryat parliament will discuss 18 bills this week.

### Koryak District Declares Itself Republic

*LD0910101590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 9 Oct 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Two months before its 60th anniversary, the Koryak Autonomous District, part of Kamchatka Oblast, has ceased to exist. A session of the district soviet has promulgated a Koryak Autonomous Soviet Republic within Russia.

### 7 Oct Aircraft Hijack Attempt Foiled

*LD0710143490 Moscow TASS in English 1427 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Vladimir Anufriyev]

[Text] Arkhangelsk October 7 TASS—Another attempt to hijack an Aeroflot flight to Stockholm was foiled today in the skies over the Arkhangelsk region (northern Russia), aviation authorities reported.

A man, identified only as Gavrilov, 26, a resident of Perm city, unemployed, threatened to blow up the An-24 plane en route from Perm to Arhkhangelsk unless it changed for Stockholm.

The airliner was preparing to land in the city of Kotlas.

The crew decided to take the risk and with the help of passengers disarmed the hijacker.

No bomb was found on him. Authorities are investigating the incident.

## Western Republics

### Belorussia, Kazakhstan Sign Cooperation Pacts

*LD0610230290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] In Minsk agreements were signed by Belorussia and Kazakhstan on development of economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation.

In an interview, Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic President Nazarbayev said: "I regard these agreements as laying a beginning for a new Union treaty of the Union of sovereign states. This is what will make up the economic base in the future. In market conditions one will have to take into account relations beneficial to each republic concerned and of mutual benefit to all sides—something which is being envisaged in our agreement."

The Belorussian Council of Ministers Chairman in an interview said: "Inter-republican relations are turning into relations between actual enterprises on the basis of the rights that the enterprises now have."

### Further Coverage of Unrest Among Crimean Tatars

#### Tatars To Defend Tent Cities

*PM0510144790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 3*

[INTERFAX report: "Situation in Crimea Becomes More Complex"]

[Text] In the last few days, tent cities where Crimean Tatars were living after returning to their homeland from deportation were destroyed in the settlement of Krasnokamenka and Yalta. As Mustafa Dzhemilev, chairman of the Crimean Tatar National Movement Organization (OKND), told INTERFAX, an oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] spokesman has stated that similar "actions" are planned in Simferopol and Yevpatoriya. It is therefore necessary to speedily remove the tent cities set up outside local authority buildings in these cities or else it will be difficult to predict the actions of "indignant Soviet citizens." Dzhemilev also reported that all roads into Yalta have been blocked by the State Automobile Inspectorate and everybody heading for this resort city is having his documents checked. In his words, Crimean Tatars are not being allowed into Yalta. The OKND chairman stressed that the Crimean Tatars have no intention of leaving their historical homeland. "We are reinforcing the tent cities on which attacks are planned, according to our information, and are preparing to defend them," Mustafa Dzhemilev stated. According to available data, there are currently 21 Crimean Tatar tent camps housing 2,550 people in the Crimea.

### Situation 'Remains Tense'

*PM0710181590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1*

[PRAVDA-TASS-INTERFAX press roundup item: "Simferopol"]

[Text] The situation in the Crimea remains tense. Additional militia detachments have arrived in the oblast. All the roads to Yalta, where there were clashes the other day between Crimean Tatars and local inhabitants, have been closed and the state highway patrol is checking the documents of everyone traveling into the health resort city to prevent the arrival of a new group of Crimean Tatars. Meanwhile two Crimean Tatar tent cities—in Yalta and the settlement of Krasnokamenka—were destroyed the other day.

### Militia Sent to Crimea

*LD0710092690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[Text] The situation in the Crimea remains tense. Additional militia detachments have arrived in the oblast. All the roads to Yalta—where a few days ago there were clashes between Crimean Tatars and local inhabitants—have been closed.

### Crimean Tatar Paper Changes Name, Format

*LD0710171890 Tashkent LENIN BAYRAGI in Crimean Tatar 22 Sep 90 p 4*

[Article by I. Ametetov: "YANGY DYUNYA - LENIN BAYRAGY - YANGY DYUNYA"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Changes will continue. As of the New Year, the newspaper will not be a party organ in the Crimean Tatar language. In the pages of the newspaper very official materials will not be published as previously was the case. Instead materials on affairs, language, culture, and the past and future of our people will be comprehensively published. The name of the newspaper will change. Its name will be YANGY DYUNYA.

YANGY DYUNYA: This is not a new name. Our elders must know this name which appeared in the Crimea in 1920-1930. They must have read it then.

At that time YANGY DYUNYA had become the beloved newspaper of the people. In the beginning it was published in Arabic script. Later it was published in Russian script entitled KYZYL KYRYM [THE RED CRIMEA]. After the German Fascists invaded the Crimea in 1941, it was published in secret for a short time. Later it was published in Krasnodar and completely disappeared in 1944. From 1944 until 1957 we lived in a dark period. In 1957 LENIN BAYRAGY began publishing.

YANGY DYUNYA is not going to be a newspaper continuing exactly the work of old YANGY DYUNYA; nor is it going to be LENIN BAYRAGY whose name has been changed. [passage omitted]

As our readers know, as of 1991 YANGY DYUNYA will be published once a week in a 16-page edition. At the time of transition to a market economy its subscription fee will change to 10 rubles per year. [passage omitted]

### Disorder Interrupts Ukrainian Parliament Session

*PM0510162090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 2*

[Report by correspondent S. Tsikora: "Rally in Street and in Hall"]

[Text] Kiev—The start of the work of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet has been wrecked. The deputies did not discuss a single item on the agenda.

Half an hour before the start of the session's work, a thousands-strong column of demonstrators with blue and yellow national flags approached the parliament building. The posters and banners bore appeals to reject the conclusion of the Union Treaty and demands for the disbandment of the Ukrainian Communist Party and the resignation of the head and the government of the republic. The deputies were handed the resolution of the packed rally of "Rukh" [Ukrainian's People Movement for Perestroyka] supporters held in Kiev the previous day and a blue and yellow flag, which parliamentarians carried into the hall. That was when it all began.

The "239 Group," which consists mainly of leading party and soviet workers and some economic planners, has a majority in the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. On the parliamentary rostrum this faction is usually opposed by "People's Council" deputies representing the new politicized public organizations. Given such a distribution of forces, the flag handed over by the demonstrators was not set up in the hall, but this incident with the flag did of course prompt the start of an open confrontation.

L. Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, who spoke at the opening of the session briefed the deputies on the situation in the republic and on the measures which might extricate it from the crisis. These include stabilization in the socioeconomic sphere, protection of the internal market, and the adoption of appropriate laws and resolutions. Academician I. Yukhnovskiy expressed the opposition deputies' viewpoint on these problems. During the debate which developed, USSR People's Deputy S. Konev accused the republic's government of the present crisis on behalf of the Association of Democratic Councils and Democratic Blocks on Soviets of People's Deputies and demanded the resignation of V. Masol, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers, and of L. Kravchuk, head of the republic. And after that the session's work was totally disorganized: The deputies did not let each other speak and used force

to push each other away from the microphones. The chairman was forced to announce a break in the session's work.

Gathered in factions, the deputies spent several hours discussing the situation. They failed to find a common language but resolved the question—by a vote. A majority inclined toward returning without delay to considering the items on the agenda.

By way of an exception the deputies decided to give the floor to L. Ratushnyy, coordinator of Kiev Strike Committee, who read out a list of demands to the republic's Supreme Soviet adopted at a session of representatives of strike and workers committees from various parts of the Ukraine.

### Pro-Constitution Rally Held in Kiev

*LD0610180790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] For peace and calm in our house: This was the slogan which most accurately defined the nature of the demonstration held today in the Ukrainian capital. The column of demonstrators consisted of participants in a republican meeting of war and labor veterans, fighters from the antifascist resistance movement, and working and young people which had taken place at the Ukraine Palace of Culture.

Participants spoke with concern and alarm about the critical situation affecting the republic's economic and political life, and about the increasing actions of destructive forces. Interventions by former fighters at the front, young servicemen, and representatives of labor collectives stressed the danger of further destabilization of the political and economic situation. An appeal was addressed to the Supreme Soviet and Government of Ukraine to take urgent measures to defend the constitution and to safeguard genuine freedom and law and order. Resolutions have been sent to the republic's parliament calling for those imprisoned in fascist concentration camps, members of militia units, and those who fought in the antifascist resistance movement to be recognized as having participated in the war, for talks to be held on compensation for the work done by prisoners of war and by those forcibly despatched to work in Germany, and for compensation to be paid to victims of the Gulag and their families. The resolutions also include demands for monuments to Lenin and to fallen servicemen to be defended, for parties of an extremist or nationalist tendency to be banned, for there to be no time limit for trying war criminals, and for a popular referendum to be held on the symbols and anthem of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist republic.

### Ukrainian, RSFSR Deputies Discuss Ties

*LD0510225490 Moscow TASS in English 2131 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] Kiev October 6 UKRINFORM-TASS—Ukrainian and Russian Federation parliamentarians met in Kiev on Friday to discuss a wide range of issues concerning the interrelations between the Ukraine and the Russian Federation after the two republics declared their state sovereignty.

The meeting co-chaired by deputy presidents of the two republics' parliaments Vladimir Grinev and Boris Isayev focused on the new Union treaty and ways of transition to a market-orientated economy.

Differing viewpoints were voiced but most of the speakers stressed that undesirable consequences might be caused by disrupting traditional links between the two republics, each having major economic, scientific and cultural potentials.

Both sides were unanimous in supporting the idea of creating a standing inter-parliamentary commission to coordinate activities.

Participants discussed a draft agreement on principles of relations beteen the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic.

The meeting was extremely necessary, Boris Isayev told UKRINFORM-TASS. "We have lived under the power-and-pressure system for many years, acting on orders from the centre and never consulting each other in republics. We made very many mistakes because we lacked good contacts, especially at the parliamentary level.

"Today we stressed that such contacts are long overdue. They will help us reach decisions acceptable not only to Russia and the Ukraine, but to the entire Union based on a commonwealth of sovereign states."

"This is the first inter-parliamentary action of the Ukraine and Russia. We agreed that we need a standing commission to control the entire system of interrelations between the two sovereign republics," Vladimir Grinev said.

The way the Ukraine and Russia view their common interests will undoubtedly affect the microclimate in the union as a whole. Seen from this viewpoint, our political dialogue today is of utmost importance". [single quotation mark as received]

## Caucasus

### Gorbachev Receives Armenia's Movsisyan 6 Oct

*NC0810114590 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the USSR, received Vladimir Movsisyan, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, on 6 October.

A wide-ranging conversation took place during which Comrade Movsisyan briefed Gorbachev about the first phase of the 29th Armenian Communist Party Congress and the congress' decision to hold an all-party (?referendum) concerning the status and the name of the republic's Communist Party.

The meeting also examined the issue of the urgent restoration of soviet and party structures in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, the restoration of gas deliveries to the republic, the lifting of the blockade, and the activation of reconstruction work in the earthquake zone.

### Armenian Supreme Soviet Makes Appointments

*NC0810114690 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] Yerevan, 5 Oct (ARMENPRES)—The Supreme Soviet of the Armenian Republic has decided to appoint Robert Megrabyan the republic's minister of foodstuff industry.

It confirmed Levon Davityan as chairman of the State Statistical Committee, and Grigor Arutyunyan as chairman of the State Committee for the Implementation of Special Economic Plans.

Robert Megrabyan, 45, is a graduate of Yerevan Polytechnic. He worked at Armenia's Ministry of Foodstuff Industry. He worked for the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and also served as first secretary of the Megrinskiy Rayon party committee.

Levon Davityan, 54, is a graduate of Yerevan State University. He worked in scientific institutions and has served as chairman of Armenia's State Statistical Committee since 1988.

Grigor Arutyunyan, 38 is a builder by trade. Since the beginning of this year he has been heading the "Yerevanshin" production association which is carrying out construction and assembly work in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

### First Armenian Defense Regiment Takes Oath

*NC0810121390 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] Ceremonial and festive occasions have become rare recently. Therefore it was only natural that the cermony held on 4 October on the grounds of the republic's military commissariat greatly impressed both those who participated in it and those who observed it. The first defense [yerkrapah] regiment of the future Armenian National Army was officially established at the state level.

The fighters (?gathered) at the parade ground. This was the first unit which was ready for the (?parade). The commanders of the battalions (?invited) the fighters to take the oath. The fighters were helped by priests to take their oath on the Bible [words indistinct]. After the swearing in ceremony, the commanders of the battalions reported to Colonel Arakelyan, commander of the newly created defense regiment. Bishop Grigoris conveyed the blessings of the catholicos of all Armenians. At the orders of the colonel, the fighters paraded before the tribune as Armenian music was played.

Congratulating the regiment Araktsyan, first deputy chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, hoped for success for the fighters [words indistinct].

Sargisyan, chairman of the Defense and Internal Affairs Commission of the republic's Supreme Soviet, and George Misirliyan, a diaspora Armenian activist, greeted the fighters.

Manukyan, chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers; Arutyunyan, deputy chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet; chairmen of the standing commissions of the republic's Supreme Soviet; and people's deputies also attended the ceremony.

### Armenia Faces Winter Without Gas Supplies

*PM0510132990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 2*

[Report by correspondent Sergey Bablumyan: "Armenia Still Without Gas"]

[Text] Yerevan—The cold breath of October has further exacerbated the calamitous position of the Armenian economy. Not a single cubic meter of gas has reached the republic since 20 August this year. Electricity supplies from the Akstafa substation on the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] have been cut off since 1 October.

The compressor station in Azerbaijan's Kazakhskiy Rayon, which pumps gas from Russia to Armenia, continues to be under lock and key. All attempts to open it through negotiations with the neighboring republic have foundered, even though the meager reserves of gas—which is used exclusively for Yerevan citizens' everyday needs—are already running out. The day is not far off when there will be no more fuel for domestic gas stoves and a major disaster will be at hand.

Incidentally, disaster has already struck rural areas and the towns and villages of the republic which were affected by the earthquake. Construction work there has been halted. This means that many thousands of homeless people will have to greet the winter cold in wind-blown shelters.

### Citizenship Restored to Armenian Exile Ayrikyan

*NC0910092790 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] Yerevan, 5 Oct (ARMENPRES)—Ara Saakyan, secretary of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet, informed ARMENPRES that the USSR President

Mikhail Gorbachev signed a decree on 4 October restoring citizenship to Paruyr Ayrikyan.

The text of the decree will be published in the press as soon as it is received from Moscow.

## Coverage of Events in NKAO Region Reported

### 'Unauthorized Secret Elections' Planned

*NC0710200090 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] The following is a disclosure made by Azerinform:

The inauspicious leaders of the Nagorno-Karabakh Movement are once again trying to escalate tension in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. These individuals have planned to hold unauthorized secret elections to the NKAO rayon and oblast people's deputies soviets on 14 October 1990. They refused to hold elections in the oblast with the entire Republic on 30 September.

In view of this, Azerinform has been instructed to make it known that only a secret administration can be established through secret elections. However, this administration can be regarded neither as a legal or real establishment nor as a state institution. Furthermore, the republic's leaders are considering the possibility of holding elections in the NKAO this year.

### Azerbaijan Protests EC Visit

*LD0510203890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1850 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] Baku, 5 Oct (AZERINFORM-TASS)—Elmira Kafarova, the head of the Azerbaijan legislature, has sent an appeal to Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The document, distributed in the republic today, says that on 3 October representatives of the European Parliament who had arrived accompanied by official Armenian representatives had endeavored to enter the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. Kafarova stresses that they did not inform either the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan SSR or the President of the Republic. Recalling that representatives of international organizations should not appear on the territory of a sovereign state without advance notice or invitation, and all the more so in an area in which an emergency situation has been declared, she noted that the visit was made without reference to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs either.

The Chairwoman of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet sees this fact as an attempt by the Armenian side to destabilize the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh.

The Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan SSR, the appeal says, protests this and asks the International Affairs Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet to condemn an action aimed at undermining the sovereignty of the USSR.

### Notes Exchanged on 'Aggression'

*LD0510205190 Moscow TASS in English 2037 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Text] Yerevan October 5 ARMENPRESS-TASS—TASS recently reported that the Azerbaijani Foreign Ministry had sent a note to the Armenian Foreign Ministry, protesting against "continued acts of aggression perpetrated by the Armenian side with the aim to split Azerbaijani territory". The note pointed out that part of Azerbaijani territory—the village of Kiarki in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic—had been annexed in the course of these aggressive actions.

The Armenian Foreign Ministry sent a reply note to Azerbaijan declaring all accusations levelled against Armenia "groundless". The Armenian government, the note stresses, has repeatedly stated that the "basis of the conflict consists not in Armenian territorial claims but in the recognition of the right of the Armenian population in Nagorno-Karabakh to self-determination".

As regards accusations of Armenian annexation of the village of Kiarki, the Armenian Foreign Ministry disposes of information that the village is now populated by Azeris who had been forced to leave the areas of their permanent residence.

The Armenian Foreign Ministry stresses that it is unwise to further fan tensions in this extreme situation in the region.

It is in the interests of both republics to look for ways to settle the dispute around Nagorno-Karabakh by peaceful means and to work towards peaceful coexistence of the two neighbouring peoples.

## Irregularities in Baku Election Reported

*LD0510141190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Report by E. Dzhafarov from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] [Dzhafarov] The election in Baku is increasingling gaining in notoriety. At the news conference for Soviet journalists that was held today, deputies from the Moscow city soviet spoke about the harassment they were subjected to by the military commandant of Baku and also about the gross violations of the law on elections in Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic.

[Begin recording] [Melnikov] I am Aleksandr Melnikov, Moscow Soviet deputy. For me the 30th [of September], the day of elections, had a splendid start. At 0700 I was detained at the polling station in the Nasiminskiy rayon executive committee after I expressed my indignation over the fact that members of the election commission

had refused entry to the polling station both for me and for the chairman of the district election commission, a member of the People's Front.

[Shevchenko] I am Svetlana Shevchenko, correspondent of the Soyuz weekly. I was invited as an observer to the elections too. When I returned to the polling station I was told that a vehicle had been sent for me, and indeed the vehicle came again and the deputy from the Mossoviet was in it.

[Dzhafarov] What can you say about the elections themselves?

[Unidentified speaker] It was a unique process in terms of the number of violations. It is simply difficult to single out something, but for example in Akstafa, the district where Khikmet Gadzhy-zade, a leader of the Azerbaijan People's Front, was a candidate his observers were beaten up. One of them, Guseynov, was not only beaten up after he demanded voting papers be counted again, but those several thugs from the party apparatus went to his elderly, 70-year-old mother and started threatening her that if she did not take her son home they would kill him.

[Dzhafarov] This is Etibar Dzhafarov reporting for the Television News Service. [end recording]

### No Results Reported

*LD0610231190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] It is still impossible to say which of the nearly 1,200 candidates have been elected to the future legislature of Azerbaijan, or how many voters exercised their right to vote at the republican election on 30 September.

[Unidentified correspondent] The Central Electoral Commission, exercising its constitutional right allowing up to 10 days for summing up the results, has not yet informed the public of the results. Reports from TASS and Interfax on the results of the elections have not been confirmed. The absence of any objective or even preliminary information is contributing to the appearance of all sorts of rumors and conjecture, the more so as during the elections to the supreme and local soviets of Azerbaijan there were cases of violations. The republican newspapers have given accounts of this.

[Alekseyev] Violations of the law began long before the beginning of the elections when the membership of the electoral commission of the 51st electoral constituency was replaced. The height of it all, you could say, was the glaring fact that at the vote counting there turned out to be 300 extra ballots in the ballot box.

[Correspondent] The republican authorities are currently checking out these and other cases. It remains for us to hope that the repeat elections in a number of Azerbaijan's constituencies will proceed without violations.

### Strike at Dzhul'fa Train Depot Reported

*NC0910095590 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] Reports have been received from Dzhul'fa that the engineering workers affiliated with the Dzhul'fa locomotive depot have been on strike for a number of days now. The movement of freight cars has been halted and the schedules for passenger cars are not being followed. A letter in KOMMUNIST published today explained the reasons for the strike and the workers' demands. The letter is by Siri Mamedov, a correspondent of the KOMMUNIST. It is entiled: The movement of the railway cars has been halted and [words indistinct].

You can read the letter on the third page of the newspaper.

### Azerbaijan Trade Union Council Holds Congress

*NC0510123990 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 4 Oct 90*

[Text] The 18th congress of Azerbaijan Council of Trade Unions concluded its work today. The congress regarded the work carried out by the Azerbaijan Council of Trade Unions during the accounting period as satisfactory. The congress adopted a resolution which outlined the measures needed to create independent, strong, and reformed trade unions and detailed the tasks of the trade unions to safeguard workers' social rights and upgrade their standard of living.

The congress approved a statement on the main organizational principles to be followed in the efforts to establish a union of Soviet trade unions and on the rules and regulations that will be applied in the work of this union. It also approved a letter addressed to the USSR Supreme Soviet in connection with the unfounded claims of the Armenian nationalists on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

The members of the republic's Council of Trade Unions were elected. Kamuran Agaguseynov was elected chairman of the Council of Trade Unions in an open ballot.

The congress also elected members of the auditing commission of the republic's trade union organization and the delegates to the 19th congress of USSR trade unions.

With this, the 18th Congress of the Azerbaijan Trade Unions concluded its work.

## Central Asia

### Central Asian Republics To Expand Cooperation

*PM0510151990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 2*

[Report by correspondent Vladimir Kuleshov under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Union of Five Republics"]

[Text] Ashkhabad—The Turkmen Supreme Soviet has approved an agreement on economic, cultural, scientific, and technical cooperation among the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan.

The main aim of the "union of five"—Turkmenia, Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan—is stated in a Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet resolution: the creation of conditions for the creative and spiritual development of the individual through the radical development of the industrial, agrarian, sociocultural, and ecological spheres. To this end the priority spheres of cooperation in the context of direct links between enterprises and organizations are currently being elaborated in Turkmenia and mutual integration measures are being outlined. Personnel of the republican State Planning Committee, State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, Finance Ministry, State Committee for Labor, Academy of Sciences, and banks and associations are involved in this. I was told the same work is being done in the other Central Asian republics. The council of chairmen of the Union republics' State Planning Committees has taken charge of coordination. In the very near future interrepublican commissions will be set up to elaborate measures on cooperation in the sphere of economic and social development.

One joint program is on ecology and water supply. The republics' State Planning Committees, Academies of Sciences, and State Committees for Nature Conservation are already involved in it. The regeneration of the Aral Sea and the fundamental improvement of the ecological and health situation in the Aral Sea region are the main purpose of the action that is to be taken.

"I am sure," A. Charyyev, deputy chairman of the Turkmen Council of Ministers, said, "that practical cooperation among our five republics will make it possible to solve within the confines of Central Asia many questions of interregional supplies of raw materials, semimanufactures, and equipment. By using direct, horizontal links between enterprises, organizations, and associations, it will be much easier to tackle problems of the development of the consumer market and consumer goods production and urgent ecological and medical problems."

### Ust-Kamenogorsk Suspends Sovereignty Debate

*PM0510102090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2*

[Report by correspondent Valeriy Mirolevich under "Direct Line" rubric: "Session Demands Equality"]

[Text] Ust-Kamenogorsk—To suspend discussion of the Declaration of Sovereignty—this was the decision adopted by a combined session of Ust-Kamenogorsk rayon soviets and city soviet of people's deputies.

The extraordinary combined session of Ust-Kamenogosk soviets of people's deputies was convened, one can say, out of alarm. People's appeals to the city soviet and resolutions of numerous labor collective meetings have indicated the people's growing tension prompted by a series of provisions in official documents which infringe the rights of the republic's Russian-speaking population. As became clear during the session, elected people's representatives of other nationalities—Kazakhs and Germans—are also worried by this.

Many people's deputies have declared that the law-making being conducted under the control of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee Ideological Commission has become a threat to social stability and civil peace in the republic.

There was something strange about the speech at the session by I. Tutevol, first secretary of the party obkom [oblast committee] and chairman of East Kazakhstan Oblast Soviet, who shifted the blame for the severity of problems discussed at the session onto... the deputies themselves. He said that they are crossing swords while he has already reached agreement, in personal talks with the higher leadership, on all the amendments to the laws that are causing unrest.

Taking account of the city population's concern for its eventual fate and in the interests of eliminating national tension, the session decided to submit a series of proposals to the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session. They include: suspending discussion of the draft Declaration of Sovereignty and excluding the draft from the session's agenda until the creation of a new document guaranteeing equal rights for all peoples living on the republic's territory. It has also been proposed to suspend the validity of the Law "On Languages..." and of the state development program for the Kazakh language and other national languages until amendments are adopted which remove discriminatory features infringing citizens' rights. It is proposed to hold a nationwide referendum on the laws on ownership, language, and the republic's sovereignty.

In case these proposals are not adopted, the deputies reserved the right, on the basis of the USSR Law "On Free National Development for USSR Citizens Living Outside the Borders of Their National and State Formations or Not Having Them on USSR Territory," to insist on the creation of a national administrative region as part of the republic with its center at Ust-Kamenogorsk.

### Plague Quarantine Lifted in Kazakh's Aralsk

*LD0510123190 Moscow TASS in English 1206 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Vladimir Ganzha]

[Text] Alma-Ata October 5 TASS—The Kazakhstan medico-sanitary service has lifted a quarantine imposed on the city of Aralsk in mid-September after an outbreak of plague in the city in which one person died.

Camel meat, which was intended for sale at the city market, was the cause of the outbreak, physicians believe. Medical specialists managed to identify and hospitalise all who had contact with the two plague patients—some 250 people.

Although the quarantine on Aralsk has been lifted, disease prevention work is continuing there. Mass inoculations of the population are under way. Expeditionary parties of medics are treating rodent burrows with pesticides to destroy fleas tha are specific carriers of plague.

"This year four plague cases were recorded in Kazakhstan—two near the north-eastern coast of the Caspian and two in Aralsk, Kzyl Orda region. In two cases, those who were taken ill could not be saved because of late diagnosis," Professor Vladimir Stepanov, head of the anti-plague institute in Alma-Ata, told TASS.

The institute specialists have now begun to monitor rodents. A computer-aided forecast will then be made about the epidemiological situation in the republic for 1991.

### Kazakhstan Declares 6 Oct as 'Republic Day'

*LD0610113790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0430 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] Exactly 70 years ago, on 6 October 1920, a declaration on the rights of the workers of Kazakhstan was adopted. Taking into account the historical importance of this first constitutional act which proclaimed the creation of the republic's national statehood, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] has decided to consider 6 October as the republic day. From now on, this day will be marked annually as a state national holiday for the Kazakh SSR.

### Tajikistan Decides Islamic Party Unconstitutional

*LD0610202590 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik 1300 GMT 6 Oct 90*

[Text] Yesterday's [5 October] evening session of the Tajik Supreme Soviet continued the discussions according to agenda. Ghafarov, chairman of the Committee for Economics and Economic Reforms; Dzhaborov, senior scientific worker of the Academy of Sciences of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]; and other speakers spoke about the changes to the draft resolution on the Tajik Supreme Soviet's stand on the program of stabilization of the country's economy and the transfer to a market economy. The resolution of the Tajik Supreme Soviet on the questions examined was adopted by [word indistinct] ballot. Barotov, deputy chairman of the Tajik Supreme Soviet Committee for Young People's Affairs, provided the session with information on the fulfillment of the draft of Tajik young people to the ranks of the Armed Forces of the USSR.

During the examination of the letter from Gaduyev and Ismonov, the following conclusion from Khovaidullayev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee on Questions of Legislation, Law, and Appeals of the Citizens, was given: Taking into consideration the fact that the program represented by the section of the All-Union Party for the Revival of Islam contradicts the Constitution of the Tajik SSR and the law of the USSR on freedom of worship and religious organizations, the committee recommended that the convening in Dushanbe of the regional conference of this party be rejected and considered the establishment of its [word indistinct] section on the territory of the republic as inadmissible.

### Party Meets Despite Ban

*LD0810123890 Moscow TASS in English 1116 GMT 8 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS corrrespondent Nina Merezhnikova]

[Text] Dushanbe October 8 TASS—A consistent conference of the local chapter of the All-Union Islamic Regeneration Party has concluded work in Tajikistan, one of the Soviet Central Asian republics.

The conference was held despite the ban imposed on October 5 by a session of the Tajikistan Supreme Soviet both on the plans to hold the conference and on the foundation of an Islamic party on republican territory. The parliament said the programme and rules of the new socio-political organization were at variance with the republican constitution.

Organising committee members held the constituent conference in the village of Chmrtut outside the Tajik capital. It was attended by nearly 300 representatives from all regions of the republic. Members of the Islamic Regeneration party from Tataria and Daghestan were invited to attend.

Many people have regarded the creation of an Islamic party in Tajikistan with disfavour, fearing the destabilisation of the socio- political situation in the republic. According to local clergymen, the Moslem clergy should maintain neutrality and focus its peace-making activity on the spiritual upbringing of people.

The chairman of the republican parliamentary committee for legislation, rights and appeals, Nurullo Khuvaidullayev, told TASS that Tajik parliamentarians were indignant at the lack of respect demonstrated with regard to the decision made by the parliament.

### Tajik Central Committee Plenum Held 4 Oct

*LD0610054690 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik 0005 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Excerpts] The fifth plenum of the Communist Party of Tajikistan Central Committee was held on 4 October. The plenum discussed the position of the Communist Party of Tajikistan Central Committee regarding the transfer of the country's economy to a market economy. Samadov, deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers [title as heard], presented a report on the issue. [passage omitted]

The plenum adopted a resolution on the subject. The plenum approved the composition of the permanent commissions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Tajikistan on cooperation with social and political organizations and nationalities relations, on organizational and ideological work, on issues of socio-economic policy, on work among women and youth, and on the issues of agricultural policy and rural reconstruction.

With this, the fifth plenum of the Communist Party of Tajikistan Central Committee concluded its work.

### Tajik Democratic Party Launches Newspaper

*LD0610110190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1803 GMT 5 Oct 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Nina Merezhnikova]

[Text] Dushanbe, 5 Oct., (TASS)—The first edition of ADOLAT (Justice), the newspaper of the Democratic Party of Tajikistan, has been published in that Central Asian republic. It is devoted to the pressing social and economic problems of the Tajik people. A considerable number of the pages of the publication are allocated to material relating to the tasks of the Democratic Party and the means of dealing with these.

As the editor of ADOLAT, Imomnazar Kholnazarov reported to TASS, every copy to the first issue was printed in Lithuania with the aid of the Sajudis movement's leaders.

The first edition of the newspaper carries articles in Tajik and Russian. It is intended to eventually publish two independent publications for Tajik and Russian readers.

The Democratic Party has been operating for only a few months in Tajikistan. It was created on the basis of a number of informal movements of the republic and has more than 7,000 members. To date however it has not registered.

### Niyazov Proposed for Turkmenistan President

*LD0610125190 Ashkhabad Domestic Service in Turkmen 1530 GMT 4 Oct 90*

[Excerpts] Most of the important decisions of the recently held 11th Congress of the Turkmenistan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] trade unions, which were aimed at activating the work of mass social organizations, were adopted. Among the questions which interested the delegates was the question of the post of the president of Turkmenistan. [passage omitted]

It was decided to propose to the Turkmenistan SSR Supreme Soviet the creation of the post of the president of the SSR and to give this post to Comrasde Niyazov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Turkmenistan SSR Supreme, and first secretary of the Communist Party of Turkmenistan Central Committee.

### Uzbekistan Draft Citizenship Law Decried

*90US0015A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 39, 26 Sep 90 p 2*

[Report by A. Kruzhilin: "The Law Is Not a Plaything...."]

[Text] **The legislative mechanisms of Uzbekistan have put forward the latest bill which could spur even more the departure of Russian speakers from the region, which has already begun. We are talking about a draft law on citizenship of the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].**

We should begin most likely with the text of the "Oath of the Citizen of the Uzbek SSR," which has to be taken hand on the constitution. Having become a citizen of the Uzbek SSR, you undertake in accordance with this oath, and aside from all else, "to desist from any actions which could damage sovereignty" and also "to respect the customs and traditions of the Uzbek people:" restrained, legal, in the spirit of the times, and unexceptionable.

However, knowing our eastern ways to some extent, I shall venture to explain what in fact is being said in these streamlined lines. The essence is most likely the fact that a person who has made a critical protest in the central press automatically becomes a violator of the oath with all the ensuing consequences. Obviously, it is this prospect that will await whoever complains to the center about oppression, or say discrimination on a nationality or language basis.

One further interesting line of the bill concerns criminal practice. The sense of it is that a citizen of the Uzbek SSR who has committed a crime may be convicted by the court of another republic only with the consent of the Uzbek SSR authorities. This position affords, in my view, a variety of offenders very tempting prospects.

Of course whether this law is enacted or not is up to the Uzbek Parliament, the Uzbek Government, and the Uzbek people, and no one has the right to teach them what precisely they should and should not enact. Nonetheless, it is probably worth remembering the difference between a document and its practical introduction. The law on the official language—necessary and justified, it should be observed—is being implemented in such a way that it has already become a reason for the departure from the republic of tens of thousands of people calling it an emigration law.

## Uzbek Council of Ministers Presidium Meets 6 Oct

*LD0710100690 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 7 Oct 90*

[Text] A session of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] was held yesterday. The situation concerning the harvesting, buying, supplying, and storage of fruit, vegetables, and other crops was examined as was the progress of the implementation of the decree of the president of the Uzbek SSR on the measures for summoning young people for military service. The progress of the implementation of a series of government decisions was also examined. Karimov, president of the Uzbek SSR, participated in the session.

A full account of the session will be published in the republican press.